

List of Works

PUBLISHED BY



William Thomson

"Seven
Edinburgh
Baynes'
in the e
translat
execute
introduc

ished in
ess. Mr
of logic,
an able
ngly well
ed by an

Baynes's Analytic of Logical Forms, 8vo,	0	7	6
Baynes's Translation of the Port Royal Logic, 12mo. Second Edition,	0	6	6
Translation of Descartes on Method, 12mo,	0	2	6
Descartes' Meditations, with Selections from the Principles, 12mo,	0	4	0
M'Cosh's (Professor) Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral, 8vo. Third Edition,	0	12	0

"Dr M'Cosh's work is of the compact cast and thought-eliciting complexion which men do not willingly let die, and we promise such of our readers as may possess themselves of it much entertainment and instruction of a high order, and a fund of solid thought which they will not soon exhaust."—*Witness*.

M'Vicar's (Dr) Enquiry Into Human Nature, 8vo,	0	7	6
--	---	---	---

"In the Metaphysical field we here encounter a new name which the world will hereafter recognise."—*Westminster Review*.

Sold by
J. MAC LAREN
BOOKSELLER
10, Prince Street
GLASGOW

R40099

WORKS PUBLISHED BY SUTHERLAND AND KNOX.

WORKS CONNECTED WITH SCOTLAND.

	£	s.	d.
Wilson's (Dr Daniel) Archæology and Pre-Historic Annals of Seotland. 200 Illustrations, royal 8vo,	1	8	0
"A very able, complete, and well illustrated work, affording nearly all the knowledge that is requisite for the purpose, not merely as far as Seotland is concerned, but as regards England and Ireland, and even Sweden and Norway. The details in the body of the volume are full, while their treatment is comprehensive; and the introductory portions are written in an enlarged and liberal spirit."— <i>Athenæum</i> .			
Stuart's Caledonia Romana. New Edition, by Professor Thomson. 21 Illustrations, 4to,	1	1	0
Directory to Noblemen's and Gentlemen's Seats, Villages, etc., in Seotland, 8vo,	0	7	6
Ross on the Law of Entail in Seotland, as altered in 1848, 8vo,	0	4	0
Ross's Leading Cases in the Law of Seotland, 3 vols. 8vo,	4	14	6
Ross's Leading Cases in the Law of Seotland. Vol. 4. <i>In the Press</i> .			

CALVIN'S WORKS.

Commentary on Genesis, 2 vols.,	0	15	0
Commentary on the Psalms, 5 vols.,	1	17	6
Commentary on Isaiah, vols. 1 and 2, each	0	7	6
Commentary on Jeremiah, vols. 1 and 2, each	0	7	6
Commentary on Ezekiel, 2 vols.,	0	15	0
Commentary on Twelve Minor Prophets, 5 vols.,	1	17	6
Commentary on Harmony of Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, 3 vols.,	1	2	6
Commentary on St John, 2 vols.,	0	15	0
Commentary on Acts of the Apostles, 2 vols.,	0	15	0
Commentary on the Romans, Old Translation, 1 vol.,	0	5	0
Commentary on the Romans, New Translation, 1 vol.,	0	7	6
Commentary on the Corinthians, 2 vols.,	0	15	0
Commentary on Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, etc., 1 vol.,	0	7	6
Institutes of Religion, 3 vols.,	1	10	0
Tracts on the Reformation, 1 vol.,	0	7	6
Tracts on Sacraments, The Catechism of Geneva, Prayers, Con- fessions, etc., 1 vol.,	0	7	6
Tracts on Counsel of Trent, German Interim, etc., 1 vol.,	0	7	6

EDUCATIONAL LIBRARY.

SUTHERLAND AND KNOX have instituted an Educational Library, consisting of many hundred volumes, in every department of Scholastic Literature, and which is open at all times to the inspection of Teachers, free of charge. Contributions will be duly added to the Collection, and their titles inserted in the classified Catalogue.

T 3.58

H O M Œ O P A T H Y :

ITS TENETS AND TENDENCIES.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

HOMŒOPATHY:

ITS TENETS AND TENDENCIES,

THEORETICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND THERAPEUTICAL.

BY

JAMES Y. SIMPSON, M.D., F.R.S.E.,

PROFESSOR OF MIDWIFERY, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH; AND PHYSICIAN-ACCOCHEUR
TO THE QUEEN FOR SCOTLAND.

PRESIDENT OF THE MEDICO-CHIRURGICAL SOCIETY, AND OF THE OBSTETRIC SOCIETY;
LATELY PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS; FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL
MEDICAL SOCIETY, AND OF THE ROYAL PHYSICAL SOCIETY, EDINBURGH;
FOREIGN MEMBER OF THE IMPERIAL ACADEMY OF MEDICINE OF FRANCE; MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY OF
SURGERY OF PARIS; AND OF VARIOUS MEDICAL SOCIETIES IN STOCKHOLM, COPENHAGEN,
BERLIN, OHENT, ETO.

BIBLIOTHECA
COLL. REG.
MED. EDIN

THIRD EDITION.

EDINBURGH: SUTHERLAND AND KNOX.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

MDCCCLIII.

"Men often swallow falsities for truths, dubiousities for certainties, feasibilities for possibilities, and things impossible as possibilities themselves."

SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*.

"Il n'y a point d'absurdités si insupportables qui ne trouvent des approbateurs ; quiconque a dessein de piper le monde, est assuré de trouver des personnes qui seront bien aises d'être pipées ; et les plus ridicules sottises rencontrent toujours des esprits auxquels elles sont proportionnées."

La Logique de Port-Royal.

TO

WILLIAM STOKES, ESQ., M.D., M.R.I.A.,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF PHYSIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN; SENIOR PHYSICIAN TO THE
MEATH HOSPITAL, ETC., ETC., ETC.

MY DEAR SIR,

ALLOW me to inscribe to you the following pages as a slight token of my esteem for your personal friendship, and of my admiration of your professional talents.

I am anxious to be permitted at the same time to convey through you to my professional brethren in Dublin, my deep sense of their exceeding kindness to me, during my visit of last Autumn, to your distinguished Medical School and City.

Among living physicians, few or none have worked either so assiduously or so successfully for the advancement of Practical Medicine as you have done. And that you may long be spared to adorn the medical profession by the lustre of your example, and to benefit medical science with the riches of your experience, is, believe me, the most sincere wish of,

MY DEAR DR STOKES,

Yours very faithfully,

J. Y. SIMPSON.

EDINBURGH, 15th March 1853.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

THE present Edition of these observations on Homœopathy is so greatly increased beyond the last as almost to form a new work. Several of the foot-notes in the Second Edition have in this been extended and enlarged into separate chapters; and various questions, formerly omitted for want of space, are now duly discussed. Let me add, that in stating the different tenets of Homœopathy, I have, with the desire of avoiding error, usually given them as far as possible in Hahnemann's own words, or in those of his leading disciples.

A great part of the following pages was written and printed last summer. I mention this circumstance in order to account for what might otherwise appear as inaccuracies in some of the printed dates; as in those to be found, for example, in the chapter on the Magnetoscope. More important avocations repeatedly intervened to stop entirely for a time the progress of the essay. And, indeed, I can only hope that the intermitting and desultory way in which the whole has been necessarily written amidst the pressure of other duties, will be accepted by my professional brethren as some excuse for the defects and repetitions which they may have occasion to observe in the execution of it.

In the Preface to the last Edition, I made the following statement, namely, that—"I at one time intended to leave out the letter to Dr Russell, and the two first pages of the speech, as they referred to personal matters more than to homœopathy. They have been retained, however, and

merely because the reason of their omission might possibly have been misinterpreted."

As I have no fear now of such misinterpretation of my motives, I have omitted the parts alluded to from the present Edition; and the more so, as I was anxious that the following chapters should contain a full exposition of the tenets of homœopathy, without unnecessarily mixing up any personal disputations with that exposition.

For the same reason, I have not answered here any of the different homœopathic attacks upon my former observations. It is said that in a hopeless and hollow law-suit, an English barrister had his brief at the day of trial handed to him with this note—"No case; but take a chance of decision in our favour by personal abuse of the opposite counsel." The homœopathic author of the principal reply to my previous pamphlet seems to have taken up the same tactics as the best or the only line of defence for his system. And I have no wish to disturb him in it; more particularly as, like an unhappy lawyer pleading a bad cause, he has himself, in my opinion, evidently no faith whatever in his own irrelevant arguments and diversified mis-statements.

The calculations in the *Appendix*, relative to the actual amount of the infinitesimal doses used by homœopaths, bring out such almost incredible results, that I deem it right to state that these calculations have been kindly and carefully looked over by four or five of the most distinguished Mathematicians in this country. I mention this as the best pledge for the accuracy of these computations.

Since the first chapter was printed, it has been publicly intimated on the part of the University of St Andrews, and of King's College, Aberdeen, that these Institutions intend to refuse their Medical Degree to practitioners of homœopathy.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Page

Preliminary Remarks regarding the Relations of Homœopathists to the Practitioners of Legitimate Medicine ; Declarations of Hahnemann on the Point ; Oath to Homœopathic Licentiates, etc.,	- -	1
--	-----	---

CHAPTER II.

Report of Speech on Homœopathy at the Medico-Chirurgical Society ; Homœopathy as Judged by the Standard of Common Sense ; Exiguity of the Infinitesimal Doses, etc.,	- - - - -	8
--	-----------	---

CHAPTER III.

Notes on the Peculiar Theological Opinions of some of Hahnemann's Disciples ; Itch Curse and Cure ; Moral and Religious Symptoms Produced and Cured by some Homœopathic Drugs,	- - -	21
--	-------	----

CHAPTER IV.

State of Homœopathy in Germany, etc. ; Number of Homœopathic Pupils at Vienna Hospitals ; Patronage of Medical Delusions by Laymen of Talent,	- - - - -	31
---	-----------	----

CHAPTER V.

Infinitesimal Doses and Homœopathy Necessarily Connected Together in Practice ; Reasons for Using the Smallest Doses ; Diseases Aggravated by Large Doses,	- - - - -	38
--	-----------	----

CHAPTER VI.

	Page
Modes of Preparation of the Infinitesimal Doses Employed by Homœopaths; Number of Triturations, Shakes, etc., Required; Infection of Globules by contact with each other, - - - -	40

CHAPTER VII.

Dynamization or Increased Potency of Drugs by Trituration and Dilution; Alleged Necessity of Exhibiting only One Medicine at One Time; but Homœopaths act constantly against this law, -	45
---	----

CHAPTER VIII.

Calculations Relative to the Actual Amount of the Infinitesimal Doses, —Decillionths, Billionths, etc.; Variations of Dilutions from 1 to 2000ths; but Effects quite the same from all the Dilutions, -	50
--	----

CHAPTER IX.

On the Exhibition of Infinitesimal Doses of Drugs by Smelling or Olfaction; Preference of Hahnemann in later life for this Method, -	61
---	----

CHAPTER X.

Proving, or Means of Determining the Symptoms which Special Drugs can Cause, and hence can Cure; instances of House-Salt, Carbonate of Lime, etc., - - - - - - -	66
---	----

CHAPTER XI.

Experience as a Test of Homœopathy; same Test claimed by all Forms of Charlatanry; Fallacies; Curative Effects of Vis Medicatrix; of Regimen and Diet; of Medical Faith, etc., - - -	78
---	----

CHAPTER XII.

Statistical Evidence in Favour of Homœopathic Practice; its Fallacy; comparison of Cases admitted at Fleischmann's Homœopathic Hospital and Edinburgh Infirmary; Mortality from Pneumonia under Expectant, Homœopathic, and Allopathic Treatment, etc., - - -	90
--	----

CHAPTER XIII.

	Page
Attempts to Obtain Physical Proofs of the Actual Existence and Activity of the Drugs contained in the Infinitesimal Doses; Magnetoscope; Supposed Visible Evidence from it of various Homœopathic Tenets; Later Experiments of Dr Madden and others, - - -	119

CHAPTER XIV.

Human Credulity—Its various Forms in Past and Present Times; Analogies in these Forms; as between Witchcraft and Homœopathy in regard to Spiritual Influences, Transformations, Defiance of Physical Laws, etc., - - - - -	138
--	-----

CHAPTER XV.

On the Law of Homœopathy as Exhibited by Nature in the Physical World; and in the Curative Effects of similar Diseases upon each other; Hahnemann's Illustrations from Small-Pox and Measles; Exposition of these Illustrations, - - - - -	148
--	-----

CHAPTER XVI.

Amount of Similarity required by the Homœopathic Law; Contradiction of the Law in Hahnemann's own instances; Succeeds when it should Fail; Fails when it should Succeed, - - - - -	162
--	-----

CHAPTER XVII.

Different Views of the Objects of Treatment in Diseases taken by the Legitimate Physician and the Homœopathist: Instances of Relative Treatment by them of Pleurisy, Tapeworm, Polypus, Itch, etc., -	173
---	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

Gain to Practical Medicine from Homœopathy; Use of Allopathic Doses by Homœopathists; Hahnemann's Denouncement of such Auxiliaries; Some Results of Adhesion to Infinitesimal Doses; Alleged Harmlessness of Homœopathy, - - - - -	187
--	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

	Page
Patronage of Medical Quackeries; Aggravations following Homœopathic Doses, and Errors of Patients as to their Effects; Rationale of Homœopathy; Supersensibility of Diseased Parts; Idiosyncracies, etc., -	199

CHAPTER XX.

Infinitesimal Globules as Articles of Diet; Doctrines of their Repetition; of the Similarity of the same Drugs to Different Dissimilar Diseases; Argument for Infinitesimal Doses from Vaccination, Mineral Waters, etc., - - - - -	224
---	-----

CHAPTER XXI.

Law of Similia Similibus Curantur; its Universality; Evidence against it from Quinine, etc.; Recapitulation of Principal Arguments (Dynamization, Experience, etc.) in favour of Homœopathy, and Answers to them; True Character of Homœopathic Cures, - - -	237
--	-----

APPENDIX.

COMPUTATIONS REGARDING THE ACTUAL AMOUNT OF THE INFINITESIMAL DOSES OR DILUTIONS USED IN HOMŒOPATHY; TABLES OF THE DOSES OR DILUTIONS, - - - - -	279
--	-----

HOMŒOPATHY.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS REGARDING THE RELATIONS OF HOMŒOPATHISTS TO THE PRACTITIONERS OF LEGITIMATE MEDICINE; DECLARATIONS OF HAHNEMANN ON THE POINT; OATH TO HOMŒOPATHIC LICENTIATES, ETC.

DURING the course of 1851, various concurrent circumstances, which it is unnecessary to detail here, tended to direct the particular attention of the medical corporations and societies of Great Britain to the anomalous position and status of practitioners of homœopathy. In consequence, the Royal College of Physicians and the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, the Medical Society of London, the Provincial Medical Association of England, and different medical Societies throughout the country, all severally passed resolutions prohibitory of their fellows and members meeting professionally with those who affect to cure the diseases of their patients in accordance with the peculiar tenets and practices of Hahnemann.

The Royal College of Physicians of London have not passed any formal general resolutions on the subject of homœopathy; but some time ago, on an application for its license or degree of Doctor of Medicine being made by a homœopathic practitioner, the College, through its President, Dr Paris, answered as follows:—

“SIR,—The foundation of the Royal College of Physicians was for the purpose of guaranteeing to the public skilful and safe practitioners.

“The College of Physicians regard the so-called Homœopathists as neither skilful nor safe practitioners.

“Therefore the College cannot, without betraying a sacred trust, give its license to persons whom they regard as wholly unworthy their confidence, and with whom it is not possible they can hold any communion.—I remain,” etc.

“JOHN AVERTON PARIS.”¹

¹ See “Lancet,” Dec. 27, 1851, p. 609.

two things :—*First*, That in the controversy regarding homœopathy all the detraction and abuse have not been confined, as some anxiously pretend, to one side ; and *Secondly*, That Hahnemann, the founder of homœopathy, and the great oracle and authority of his sect, himself declared some twenty years ago, what the British medical corporations and societies have declared now (and what *they* have been held up as “ unjust ” and “ persecuting ” for declaring),—namely, that the practitioners of homœopathy cannot professionally co-operate or associate with the legitimate physicians of the “ old school,” for homœopathy, as Hahnemann solemnly avowed and pronounced, “ if rightly apprehended, will be found to be so EXCLUSIVE, and in that way only serviceable, that as the doctrine is pure, so must the practice be also ; and all backward straying to the pernicious routine of the old school (whose opposite it is, as day is to night), is *totally impossible*.”¹ Now, certainly, the late resolutions of our medical colleges and societies have done nothing more than carry this opinion and dictum of Hahnemann regarding his own followers into virtual effect ; and surely it is inconsistent on the part of these followers and others, to hold up such a tardy step as an instance of “ persecution.” At the same time, in adopting this step, the colleges and societies have so far discharged their duty to the profession and the public, by at last testifying before them, in what light the leading medical bodies view the creed and principles of the homœopaths. To ask men holding that creed, and practising upon these principles, to dissociate themselves from our medical colleges and societies, is certainly no more an act of injustice than it would be for a Christian Church to remove from its communion those who held the creed and practised the tenets of Mohammedism or Buddhism, Mormonism or Swedenborgianism, or of any other extreme and exclusive religious heresy. With the opinions which the medical societies and colleges have formed of homœopathy, they were as much bound to dissociate from them the followers of Hahnemann, as they would be bound to dissociate from them the followers of Morrison, or Coffin, or St John Long, or of any other extreme and exclusive medical heresy. Nay, should not the expressed doctrines and published tenets of Hahnemann on this point have led the homœopaths to take this step themselves, and of their own accord, instead of forcing so disagreeable a duty upon the Colleges ? In our own country, and in our own times, we

¹ Preface to the Fifth Edition of the “ Organon,” p. xii.

have seen Professors of Theology in our Universities, and numbers of clergymen, voluntarily, and as an act of simple common honesty, withdraw themselves from those corporations and communions whose principles they could no longer hold; and this in cases where the communion to which they belonged, and not they themselves, had changed their belief. And would not each one of these men have felt and considered his integrity surrendered and subverted, if he had persisted in retaining privileges, and drawing pecuniary emoluments, connected with a creed which he had come to repudiate? It might have been found difficult or impossible to deprive, for instance, Dr Chalmers or Dr Welsh of their Professorial chairs and salaries in the University of Edinburgh, after they renounced the authority and discipline of the Established Church of Scotland; but if these eminent men had then insisted on retaining, in the University, whatever of station or emolument they could retain legally, would the world not have pronounced a severe verdict on their sense of moral honour and uprightness?

If it were necessary, it would, as I have already observed, be easy to add from other modern homœopathic writings, abundant proof of the exclusive spirit of homœopathy, and its opposition to regular and legitimate medicine. Let me adduce a single instance. In America, one or two institutions for licensing practitioners of homœopathy have been set on foot. The regulations of one of these licensing bodies at Rio have been published at some length in a work by Dr Mure, who was for a time President of the Institution. Each candidate for the license of medical homœopathic practice, is first called upon to “make voluntarily” a “Profession of Faith,” commencing as follows:—

“My hand upon my conscience, and my eyes upturned to heaven, I embrace homœopathy, and declare, after having examined attentively and impartially the various systems of medicine, that I acknowledge the doctrine of Hahnemann to be the only true medical doctrine,” etc. etc.

And subsequently, with all the company present listening “in religious silence,” the candidate for the license of practice was required to take the following grave homœopathic *sponsio*, or

OATH.

“By our Saviour Jesus Christ, who suffered and died for us, redeeming our sins by his precious blood, and by virtue of his pains obtaining for us

eternal felicity : by our Divine Redeemer, whom I ought to imitate as far as human weakness permits, I swear:—

“ 1. To redeem the sufferings of the sick by the preventive sufferings of pure experimentation, which I shall make myself, or by means of persons animated by the like charity.

“ 2. Not to treat patients but by medicaments whose effects have been well proved, which are in the domain of pure homœopathy, as I have acknowledged and declared in my profession of faith.

“ 3. To observe strictly the precepts of the gospel in the exercise of my duties, regarding as sacred objects the secrets of families, virtue, the modesty of women, and the indigence of the poor.

“ 4. To propagate the knowledge of the principles of Pure Homœopathy by all lawful means in my power.

“ 5. To profit as much as possible by the propagation of the principles of homœopathy, and by the advantages of its application, in order to make them serve to diffuse Christianity, to further Christian instruction, and the civilisation of the Indians; and to require of Pagans, Mohammedans, idolaters, and other infidels, their conversion to the faith, before initiating them into a knowledge of the principles of homœopathy.

“ And this I swear, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

I have extracted the preceding translation of this homœopathic oath and profession of faith from a review of Dr Mure's work, in the “British Journal of Homœopathy” for 1849,¹ a Journal edited by Dr Rutherford Russell of Edinburgh, Dr Drysdale of Liverpool, and Dr Dudgeon of London. The profession of faith and very solemn oath thus imposed upon medical students coming forward as candidates for the license of practice, are quoted in the Journal edited by these physicians, without one single word of doubt or blame upon the “illiberality” of the proceeding, or one single hint or observation upon the “impropriety” of forcing the young and inexperienced medical licentiate to swear to maintain through life, at the risk of perjuring himself, a creed which ninety-nine out of every hundred medical men deem to be utterly false. Indeed, after quoting the profession of faith, the preceding oath, and other steps in the process of licensing, the only comment which is added in this “British Journal” is the following:—“This august ceremony was repeated last year, and it is hoped the occasion for it may be perennial.”²

¹ British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. vii. p. 535, etc.

² Yet one of these same editors, Dr Russell, a short time subsequently, published in the same Journal a letter full of “intense indignation” (to use his own words) against the “folly, criminality, and cruelty” of remitting, for a few weeks, a candidate for a medical degree at a British University, on account of “serious doubts as

The spirit and tendencies of these proceedings and observations of Hahnemann, and of his modern disciples, is, I believe, too self-evident to require any remarks to be added in the way of commentary.

to the soundness of his principles of practice," and "his insufficiency (of knowledge) on some subjects of examination" (surgery and medical jurisprudence). In consequence of the remission of this intending homœopathist, Dr Russell, his two brother editors, their patients, and many others, signed a petition to the Patrons of the University of Edinburgh on the matter, praying them to prevent "any undue attempts to interfere with the full liberty of students of medicine." (See a full Analysis of this very foolish "monster petition" in the "Monthly Journal of Medical Science" for February 1852, pp. 157 to 163.)

Amongst the signatures to this petition, the names of Clergymen are particularly numerous. Would these Clergymen have given the license of *their* diverse churches or denominations to any student whom they knew to be a believer in the tenets of Unitarianism, or Mormonism, or Mohammedism, and who avowed his intention to preach and practise these doctrines? Or would they consider the refusal of *their* different licenses to such persons, as (to repeat their own words) "undue attempts to interfere with the full liberty of students" of theology?

More lately, there was formed, and widely advertised, an "Association for the Protection of Homœopathic Students and Practitioners." The funds of this association have been in part, if not principally, used to enable Dr Russell to publish at a cheap rate a volume intended to promote the cause of homœopathy; and misrepresenting and abusing personally various members of the medical profession here and elsewhere. The volume thus edited by Dr Russell contains, amongst other matter, a defence, by the Rev. Mr Everest, Vicar of Wickwar, against an exposition of his homœopathic theology and doctrines by Dr Cormack.—(For an account of Mr Everest's Hahnemannian Sermon and Theology, see subsequently, chapter iii. p. 24.)—In the list of the Association in question there are the names of four or five Edinburgh clergymen, contributing thus with their money to the republication of this defence of Mr Everest's Sermon. Let us, for their own sakes, charitably hope that they did not intend by this act to signify their approval and homologation of Mr Everest's theologico-homœopathic tenets.

On the fly-leaf of the first Number for 1852 of the "British Journal of Homœopathy," edited by Dr Russell, etc., there is an advertisement of Dr Russell's volume, and it is therein stated, that "the Association has *already* enrolled among its members, names of the *highest* weight in the political, social, and literary world." At the end of his volume, published months subsequently to this advertisement, Dr Russell has indiscreetly printed the names of the male members of this Association. Unfortunately for the truth even of the advertisement, brief as it is, of the volume, there is not, in the whole of this list, the name of any man of any note or eminence whatever in science or politics. And the only name among them known, as far as I am aware, in the literary world, is that of a very eccentric dignitary of the Episcopal church, who has long been known as an especial patron of clairvoyance, mesmerised water, impossible cures of blindness, homœopathy, and the like.

CHAPTER II.

REPORT OF SPEECH ON HOMŒOPATHY AT THE MEDICO-CHIRURGICAL SOCIETY ; HOMŒOPATHY AS JUDGED BY THE STANDARD OF COMMON SENSE ; EXIGUITY OF DOSES, ETC.

[At their first meeting for the Winter Session 1851-52, the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh unanimously passed a resolution of a similar character to those already mentioned. Professor Syme moved,—“ That the public profession of Homœopathy shall be held to disqualify for being admitted or remaining a Member of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh.” A report of Mr Syme’s remarks, and of those made by myself in seconding Mr Syme’s motion, was published in the “Monthly Journal of Medical Science” for December 1851. The portion of this report containing my observations to the Society, is reprinted in the following Chapter, with, as stated in the preface, the omission of those matters which were merely personal.]

Dr Simpson seconded Mr Syme’s motion.
For one, Dr Simpson rejoiced that the Colleges had taken up the subject, and set the matter on its right footing, by making the question of meeting homœopathists not a question longer left to the responsibility and importunities of individuals, but a question which the profession had fixed and settled in their *corporate* capacity.

The resolutions of the Colleges would, he believed, be doubly useful by not only determining for the future the proper line of duty of the profession towards homœopathists ; but by showing also to the homœopathists their exact position in relation to the profession. Almost all the fellows of our two Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons belong to the Medico-Chirurgical Society ; and in their capacity as fellows of their respective Colleges, have already unanimously approved of the resolutions of the Colleges regarding the propriety of

excluding homœopathists from our professional communion. Most, if not all, of the members of the Medico-Chirurgical Society who do not happen to be fellows of either of the Colleges, hold, I believe, the same views. In requesting, therefore, the practitioners of homœopathy to withdraw themselves from us, the Medico-Chirurgical Society is merely, so far, carrying into practical effect the resolutions of the Colleges on this same subject. And most of the members are probably aware that while very strong legal doubts exist as to public chartered corporations, like the two Colleges, having the power of exercising this right, fortunately, any private unchartered Society, like the Medico-Chirurgical, need fear no legal obstacle in enforcing their judgment. In passing therefore—and it is to be hoped, unanimously—such a motion as that proposed by Mr Syme, we, the members of the Medico-Chirurgical Society, show our anxiety and desire to be rid of the professional presence of homœopathists in all our institutions, by showing them our determination to be rid of them in those places from which we have an undoubted right of enforcing their exclusion. Every proper feeling of respect for ourselves, and every proper feeling of regard for the advancement of the great science which we cultivate, seem now to call upon us for this disagreeable step. For years past they have been allowed, and almost without gainsay or resistance on our part, to hold up to the lay public all the best acknowledged principles of our medical philosophy and practice—principles that have stood the test of thousands of years—as delusions and errors.¹ And they cannot surely deem us

¹ My friend, Dr James Russell, in a letter which he has published in favour of homœopathy, observes, “In the meeting of the Medico-Chirurgical Society, some homœopathists were spoken of as holding up all the best acknowledged principles of our medical philosophy and practice—principles which have stood the test of thousands of years—as delusions and errors. I have not (says Dr Russell) so spoken, nor has any one ever spoken so in my hearing.” But see the quotations in our preliminary remarks, p. 2, where we find Hahnemann himself denouncing the principles of common rational medicine as the “exact opposite” of the principles of homœopathy, as different “as day is from night.” With a tone of perfect and indisputable infallibility, Hahnemann elsewhere remarks, “It is IMPOSSIBLE that there can be another true best method of curing dynamic diseases, that is *all* diseases not strictly surgical, besides homœopathy, just as it is impossible to draw more than one straight line betwixt two given points.”—(*Organon*, p. 206.) See also, for the same opinion, the same work, p. 156. Amongst other differences, let me instance only one example. We all place much value upon the study of *Morbid Anatomy*. In regard to the internal organic changes (cancer, tubercles, etc. etc.) seen on inspection of the body after death, and which the practiser of the pseudo-art of allopathy is (says he) in the habit “of pointing out to the sorrowing relatives,” Hahnemann insinuates or rather avers

either rash or severe in our proceedings, if slowly, but at last, we turn round and ask them, as we do to-night, to remove themselves from amongst men whose opinions they systematically affect to deride and decry. Nay, what good can they themselves derive from pertinaciously adhering to a Society like ours, composed of professional men banded together with the view of cultivating medical science in a mode and on principles which they at one time professed to honour, but which they now profess to repudiate? As Mr Syme has properly observed, they have in fact already all but separated from our Society, inasmuch as they have alienated themselves from our Society and College meetings and discussions, as if ashamed of the very step which they had taken. When we ask them to retire from our Society, as Mr Syme's motion proposes, we ask them merely to sever entirely a tie which they have already virtually broken.

Dr S. further argued for the propriety of this motion on another ground,—viz., that the presence of homœopathists at our Society, even if they did come to our meetings, was not at all calculated to promote that principal and leading object of the Medico-Chirurgical Society,—the cultivation and advancement of medical science and knowledge. For he held that no man, or set of men, could in any degree aid in effecting this object, who entertained principles such as those which form the basis of the homœopathic belief. We were as much justified in asking those who had taken up a belief in the follies of Hahnemann and his *Organon* to withdraw from our Society, as a Christian community would be justified in expelling those of its members who came to believe in the follies of Joe Smith and the Mormon Bible. These two heresies—the homœopathic and the Mormonite—seemed, in fact, to have many points in common, though the one belonged to medicine, and could only be properly

(*Organon*, p. 180), (as far as I understand his language), that “those deceitful records, the illustrated works on Pathological Anatomy, exhibit the products of such lamentable bungling” merely as results from allopathy. In another work, addressing allopathic physicians, he observes, “Be not too anxious to insist on the dissection of the corpses of those you have done to death. You would not do it did you know what you thereby revealed to him who knows the truth. . . . There is displayed (in dissections) not what was present before your treatment, as you would fain persuade the relatives, but what was *produced* by your treatment!”—*Hahnemann's Lesser Writings*, by Dr Dudgeon (1851), p. 840. I should hope that Dr Russell will consider with me that such opinions on morbid anatomy *must* have been known to Hahnemann to be ridiculously untrue; and are, as such, highly discreditable to him.

judged of by physicians; and the other belonged to theology, and could only properly be judged of by clerical men. They were both equally wild. Some homœopathists profess Hahnemann to have been inspired; as the Mormonites hold Smith to have been. Both heresies also were extending, it was true; but that was no evidence of the value of either. It has been alleged that we have no confession of faith in medicine,—no standard by which we can possibly judge, as clerical bodies do, of the amount of error and deviation of those members of the profession who, from time to time, may choose to set at naught the common principles of that profession. But we have a confession of faith, and a standard by which we *can* judge such men, namely, THE STANDARD OF COMMON SENSE. If we judge by this simple standard the opinions of Hahnemann and his followers, we will find them sadly, very sadly, wanting. In fact, all the dogmas and doctrines peculiar to him, are a tissue of the strangest contradictions and wildest absurdities. If a grown-up man were gravely and seriously to assert to the world that two and two make five, the world would be inclined to look upon him as doubtfully rational, inasmuch as he defied the principles of common sense. And when other grown-up men tell the world that they can cure this or that disease with a billionth or decillionth of a grain of this or that common and probably even inert drug, they express an opinion perhaps even more intensely and directly absurd than the doctrine of two and two making five. All men can at once, because without any great intellectual effort, see through the foolishness and impossibility of the idea of two and two making five, but they do not equally see through the absurdity and impossibility of the more complicated, but equally ridiculous idea, of the billionth or decillionth of a grain of oyster-shell, or chamomile, or belladonna, or the like, having any possible effect whatever upon the economy, for, resting contented with the mere name, they never once think or dream of what in reality a billionth or a decillionth amounts to. Medical jurists and lawyers know of no poison, however strong and powerful, the billionth or decillionth of which would in the least degree affect a man or harm a fly. They tell us that the mere division of their drugs invests them with “tremendous” power;¹ but they could not injure or

¹ Let us imagine for a moment, in the way of illustration, a parallel case, and one where the comparison being taken from another department of art, the question is not easily capable of being rendered complex or casuistical, as has too often happened, when the human body and the art of physic were implicated in it. Suppose (to take

hundred millions of human beings. If all these nine hundred millions of human beings had lived during the past six thousand years, and each of them had swallowed, every moment of their existence, a decillionth of a grain, such as the homœopaths use, they would not during these six thousand years, have finished one single grain; nay, one grain would, in fact, suffice them all for millions and millions of years yet to come. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* for October 1851, in order to give his readers some idea of the numbers that were published of the catalogue of the Great Exhibition, states, that if these catalogues were placed in a vertical line or row, the base of which was at the bottom of the Pacific, the apex of the row would reach as high as the top of Chimborazo. About twenty homœopathic globules make an inch, and if each of these contained a decillionth of a grain, as some homœopaths profess to use them, a continuous row of these decillionth globules would make a line which would stretch from the bottom of the Pacific, not only as high as Chimborazo; or even as far as the moon; but it would extend many, many times from the sun to the outermost planet in our system; or even as far as any known star. A grain of belladonna or other of their drugs, distributed in such decillionth-dose globules, would make continuous lines many, many million times longer than all the railroads and other roads that ever were, or ever will be, formed on the face of the earth; nay, they would cover the surface of all these roads many million times, in all their lengths and breadths. And yet, say the homœopaths, take a pin's point and lift out a few of these belladonna globules spread out on these interminable lines of road, and you will cure with them a case of scarlet fever. Surely men holding such fantastical doctrines, are not men mentally fit to be members of such a Society as this. They are heretical to the extent of utterly outraging the confession of faith that we use in medicine,—*the standard of common sense*; and they cannot rightly deem us tyrannical if, in consequence, we request, in such a Society as this, to be relieved of their companionship.

One remark of Mr Syme regarding the number of homœopathic practitioners in Edinburgh, reminded Dr Simpson of a curious feature in homœopathic practice among us. He was not sure of how many practitioners of homœopathy we had in Edinburgh: but they were all conversant with the fact, that there were three homœopathic drug-shops in the town. That fact was in itself a significant and illustrative fact. He did not know the number of drugs that homœopaths used, but he did not suppose that they exceeded 250 or 300

separate articles. He was not aware what a grain of each might cost ; but he imagined, not above a penny or two at most, on the average. And one single grain in even their fourth or fifth dilutions, would, of course, be sufficient during any one druggist's lifetime, not only for a whole town such as Edinburgh, but for a whole universe ; while a grain of a drug divided into quintillionths or decillionths might in truth serve an entire race during an entire geological epoch. A homœopathic apothecary's stock in trade could not consequently well exceed a few shillings, or a few pounds at most, and need not surely require renewal during the longest lifetime. And yet these same homœopathic dilutions seem convertible, through an adequate amount of credulity on the part of the public, into annual incomes sufficient for the maintenance of three thriving drug establishments ! To effect this, the druggists must sell their pharmaceutical exiguities at something like a billionth or decillionth of profit. He did not blame the druggists for this, or for charging, as they did, very smartly for the globules which they sold. Their high price was indeed in itself a more potent therapeutical agency than any problematical medicinal matter which they contained ; for what a man pays a high price or sum for, must, he naturally believes, be of high value.¹ But surely we may well smile at the deluded buyers zealously emptying their purses in the purchase of such dreamy nonentities.

Nor did it seem necessary that the globules of sugar of milk should go even through the form of being medicated with their supposed quadrillionths, quintillionths, etc., of the drug whose name they

¹ According to Dr Schubert's evidence regarding the opinions and practices of Hahnemann, the founder of homœopathy was perfectly aware of this fact. "Hahnemann never hesitated (says Dr Schubert) to promise recovery to every patient, without concerning himself about the nature of the malady ; and I have seen some ludicrous results follow these predictions. His plan was to demand for the cure, in the shape of a fee, a good round sum—one half to be paid down,—unlimited confidence in his treatment, doses of sugar of milk (undrugged), and a particular diet. The dieting, which simply consisted in the denial of all stimuli, he considered to be absolutely necessary in order to allow nature to have free play. Unlimited confidence in the treatment was his great support in carrying out this system ; and he invariably insisted upon this from every patient, well knowing that it was the important secret of life and death in such cases. Further, he used to observe, 'We must not attend patients for nothing, or let them have even a pennyworth of medicine gratuitously ; the greater the sum paid for physic and physician, the greater is the confidence placed in both.'"—*Casper's Wochenschrift* for March 1845.—*Northern Journal of Medicine* for 1845, p. 191.

bore. At least it had been averred that some in England who affected to manufacture these medicated globules on the large scale, had found that the sugar of milk, of which these globules were composed, answered just as well with or without a dip in the pretended dilutions.¹ And, as far as regarded the patient and the disease, it mattered nothing what globule was given—whether one of charcoal or of arsenic. They were both so diluted as, of course, to be entirely inefficacious: and all the drugs and globules in a homœopathic medicine-box being rendered equally null and innocent by their previous reduction, any one of them could readily and successfully replace any other.

Early in the history of homœopathy in Edinburgh, Dr Simpson had witnessed a circumstance proving, if any proof were required in such an instance, that all homœopathic globules act alike,—that any one may replace any other in the list; and that it is the belief with which the drug is taken, and not the infinitesimal drug itself, which produces the effect ascribed to it. Some eight or ten years ago, an old schoolmate of Dr Simpson having begun business as a homœopathic druggist in Liverpool, kindly sent Dr S. a present of a small box of homœopathic medicines; and a very beautiful painted box it was. During the time it was in Dr S.'s possession, he put it only to one use, viz., he gave it as an occasional plaything to his eldest son, who was then a child. The boy, revelling in his permitted amount of mischief, used in his sport to uncork the small bottles, empty their globules into a heap and then refill the bottles from the general mass. Of course, this had speedily the effect of altering and disarranging the contents of the entire lilliputian drug shop; the globules pertaining to the different bottles were more or less thoroughly mixed together; and sometimes, when the child was tired of his occupation, others at last refilled the bottles from the general heap. A professional brother happening to call at Dr S.'s house one day when Dr S. was absent from home, saw the box, and put it

¹ See a statement by Dr Glover of Newcastle, in the *Lancet* for January 11, 1851, regarding a London firm manufacturing 60 lbs. weight of homœopathic drugs every fortnight; but who were "so well aware (says Dr Glover) of the farce, as never even to attempt the troublesome mode of manufacture required by homœopathy, so that the drugs really and truly contain *nothing*." In a late letter, Dr Glover informs me, that the agent of a London wholesale firm, which is either the first, or about the first, house in the line, made the statement in question before witnesses, in the house of the Messrs Gilpin and Company, Druggists, Newcastle.

in his pocket. Many weeks afterwards, the new proprietor of the box met Dr S., and told him that he had been trying to practise homœopathically, at which Dr S., expressed his regret; and he added, that he had seen some wonderful effects and cures from using the drugs contained in Dr S.'s own former homœopathic box! Wrongly perhaps, as Dr S. now thinks, he did not at the time tell this physician that the globules of the bottles which he had been using were elaborately commixed; but the whole struck him as so good a joke at the moment, that he thought he would reserve it to bring it out upon his friend on some future and more ripe occasion, for the purpose of laughing him out of his homœopathic delusion. But, unfortunately, matters hastened rapidly on; the physician became more and more a homœopathist; and then it became too serious a matter to joke about, when he actually published a list of supposed homœopathic cures. The whole thing assumed so grave an aspect that he never mentioned it, until the physician, who had appropriated the box, had become far too hardened in his homœopathic practices to allow of any hope of his re-conversion. From the time that the physician in question mentioned the results of using the box, till within the last few months, he and Dr S. never spoke on the subject of either the box or homœopathy. But the conversation turning on this last occasion upon the box, he remarked to Dr S., that Dr S. had no right to say, as he had heard reported, that it was the use of Dr S.'s commixed box of medicines that had converted him to homœopathy; because, as he added, he had another box of homœopathic drugs at the time he began, and Dr S. had no power of knowing that it was not this other box that he had employed. Dr S., of course, confessed that he had no means of knowing that it was Dr S.'s former box which he had employed, excepting this, that previously he had distinctly and deliberately told Dr S. that it was Dr S.'s old box that he had used, and the results of which had effected the change in him at the time of the first conversation. And Dr S. felt sure of one other circumstance, namely, that if that physician, or any other homœopathist, would use homœopathic boxes equally commixed as that which Dr S. once possessed, they would get results just as good as they would obtain from the supposed non-mixed globules. There is a homœopathic hospital now in London. If the physicians of it will take twenty or thirty boxes of homœopathic drugs, and allow any one to commix the contents of a few of them, and to furnish others with nothing but sugar of milk globules,

they would find it, he believed, utterly and totally impossible, after trials of weeks or months, to point out the medicated from the non-medicated boxes, and those whose contents were thoroughly mixed, from those whose contents were all in due form and order. And he felt assured that the Society and the medical profession would join him in his sincere conviction and belief, that such an experiment was not in the least degree objectionable, in as far as the good and safety of the patients of the homœopathic hospital were concerned.¹ For whether the drugged or undrugged globules were exhibited, one and the same result would follow,—viz., that the diseases of the patients would, under either mode of management, be allowed to go on uncontrolled and uninfluenced to their own natural termination. Fortunately for such an inane and negative practice as homœopathy, most diseases, even acute inflammation of the lungs, &c., did, in a large proportion of cases, tend ultimately towards a successful and happy termination, through the spontaneous and unaided efforts of nature alone;² and the swallowing of a few infinitesimal globules of

¹ Hahnemann himself even, would, in his hours of sincerity, probably have sanctioned the truth of this statement. It has been often questioned whether Hahnemann, like the "prophet" Joe Smith, used the talents bestowed upon him only to dupe others, or whether he was enough of a visionary to believe in his own various incredible doctrines. The published evidence of one who knew Hahnemann, Dr Schubert of Dramburg, goes so far to prove that the founder of homœopathy was himself far more knavish than foolish. "We hear it (remarks Dr Schubert) continually asserted, that Hahnemann placed no confidence in the powers of nature in curing disease; but from my intercourse with him, I am quite satisfied that no physician ever trusted more to the *vis medicatrix nature*. It requires, indeed, but very little reflection to enable us to perceive, that it was through the closest acquaintance with the curative powers of nature, that Hahnemann was led to adopt his new system of medicine. I have heard him declare that he looked with contempt upon medical practice, and he thought that a patient would be none the worse if left to himself. He had a thorough conviction that all curable diseases might, under proper attention to diet, be removed by the efforts of nature alone. He looked upon these as his sheet-anchor. On one occasion he said to me, 'I give medicines but very seldom, although I always prescribe small powders. I do this for the sake of keeping up in the patient's mind the firm belief that each powder contains a particular dose of some medicine. Most patients will get well by adopting a simple mode of living, and by placing a boundless confidence in their medical attendants. Ordinary practitioners know nothing of this practically, although they are always talking of the healing powers of nature.'"—*Casper's Wochenschrift* for 1845. On Hahnemann's use of small powders, to "quiet the patient or his friends," but which contained sugar only, see Dudgeon's Edition of the *Organon*, p. 302.

² The later observations of Louis, Grisolle, Dietl, and others, have shown this to hold true with regard to a large class of cases of *uncomplicated* pneumonia, and other

any kind would not alter in any degree this result. But Dr S. feared that if he spoke longer he might fall into the error alluded to by Mr Syme,—viz., the error of discussing the merits, or rather demerits, of homœopathy; while the Society were met, not for this purpose, but for the purpose of expressing their judgment in regard merely to the propriety of practitioners of homœopathy withdrawing from the Society.

There was another class of practitioners who ought, he thought, certainly to be included in the category of those whose names should be removed from the list of members. He alluded to such practitioners as were not simple-minded, but sincere homœopathists. He alluded to those who pretended to be homœopathists, but acted as allopathists,—who doctored people according as people themselves wished, either with draehms of drugs, or billions of a grain of the same; who wished to be considered homœopathists, but, as had been often detected, drugged their globules and tinctures with active doses of the most powerful medicines; who spread out the snare of homœopathy as a golden man-trap to catch credulous and trusting patients, and afterwards either openly or surreptitiously applied to them all the usual means employed in the armamentarium of rational medicine. Some men pretended they could honestly and honourably mix up the two practices.¹ Most physicians naturally doubted whether any

acute inflammations; just as it was previously known to hold true with regard to a large class of cases of *uncomplicated* fever; and the observations of the homœopathists have fully, though unwittingly, confirmed the same important pathological remark.

¹ “The public who see homœopathic doctors, generally conceive that their medicines are given to them in the attenuations of Hahnemann, in quantities ranging from a millionth to a decillionth of a grain. ‘Little pills’ were lauded by a platform speaker at the homœopathic meeting in Freemasons’ Tavern; but his laudations were perhaps applauded by men (homœopathic practitioners) who give as freely, or more freely, than many of us would dare to do, strychnia, aconite, and other such like drugs, the most terrible doses of which may be administered in drops, and fractions of a grain. Large doses of our common medicines, as I well know, are also every day prescribed by men who come forward as candidates for homœopathic practice among the wealthy and noble. ‘Little pills’ may be, but certainly a little quantity of physic is not, a criterion by which to know the practitioners who range themselves under the flag of homœopathy. Dr Quin openly advised what I may term very large doses of camphor in cholera; and in my own experience, I have found that patients had been taking along with the globules (under the name of adjuvants), the same medicines, and in the same doses, which we employ, and which experience has sanctioned. What is *now* called homœopathic practice may, I aver, mean any kind of practice. I have said enough to show you how vain it is to define what is meant by

man could in honour and honesty combine such incompatible incongruities. Neither any true homœopath¹ nor any true allopath would

homœopathic practice, when I mention, that, at a recent meeting of the 'Annual Congress' of homœopathists, there was present, as a large participator in the business, Dr William M'Donald, who, besides being a homœopathic practitioner, is a leading man as a believer in, and lecturer on, the highest degrees of mesmerism. Then Dr Macleod (whose autobiography I hold in my hand), the keeper of a water-cure inn at Benrhydding, in Yorkshire, is a chosen champion of homœopathy; a man whom the *Homœopathic Times* delights to honour, and who treats his patients by globules and wet sheets. Dr Henderson of Edinburgh, Dr Calvert Holland, and Mr Kingdon of London, prescribe infinitesimal or ordinary doses, according to their own or their patient's fancy. I select these gentlemen as my examples, because their acts are before the public in print. The medical creed of these practitioners it is impossible for us to comprehend."—*Report of the Speeches on Irregular Practice, delivered at the Nineteenth Anniversary Meeting of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association held at Brighton, August 13 and 14, 1851. Speech of Dr Cormack, p. 10.*

¹ Since this speech was first published in the "Monthly Journal," my colleague, Professor Henderson, has avowed and defended the mixed practice. He says, "I rejoice to say that I know many physicians, who, while they adhere to the homœopathic law as the great regulator of their practice, consider themselves entitled, in the free exercise of their profession as independent men, to prescribe any quantity of medicine they think necessary for their patients, and where the homœopathic principle cannot be of service to them, whether from its own present or necessary limitations, or their insufficient acquaintance with it, consider themselves not only at liberty, but bound in duty, to employ any other expedients for the benefit of their employers that may be within their knowledge." I am unwilling to characterise such a doctrine in the terms which most medical men would agree that it deserved; for, with others, I confess I cannot see how the same medical man can himself conscientiously treat the same disease, as pleurisy, pneumonia, &c., either with full allopathic measures and doses, as bleeding, antimony, &c., or only with infinitesimal doses of phosphorus, bryonia, aconite, &c.; or how in consultation he can approve of some practitioners following the one plan, and of other practitioners pursuing the other. But I gladly leave the due estimation of such a combination of principles and practices to the criticism of the homœopathists themselves. "Monstrous conjunction (exclaims Dr Mure); sacrilegious enterprise! Withered be the hand which shall attempt to realise it!" (the conjunction of allopathy and homœopathy.)—*Doctrine de l'Ecole de Rio, p. vi.*

"There is (says a homœopathic physician, lately practising in Edinburgh,) a class of practitioners who merit the indignation of every right-minded man,—a class who, viewing medicine only as a trade, a mere barter for pounds, shillings, and pence, act obsequiously, as the patient wishes; at his desire, their practice is either homœopathic or allopathic. Such unprincipled procedure admits of no apology."—Dr Black's *Treatise on Homœopathy, p. 163.*

Or, leaving these lesser homœopathic authorities, let us turn to the opinions of the founder of this form of "new physic." In the last edition of his *Organon*, as elsewhere, Hahnemann repeatedly denounces, to use his own words, "the new mongrel sect who assume the honourable name of Homœopathists, and even seem to employ medicines

give this spurious set credit for their integrity of purpose and principle. If any such were members of the Society, let them certainly and undoubtedly be requested to retire. Their conduct was the conduct of the poor Swiss clergyman, who, living in a district partly of Romanists and partly of Protestants, thought it no discredit to eke out his living by preaching a strong Romanist sermon to the Romanists in the forenoon, and a strong Protestant sermon to the Protestants in the afternoon. He repeated, that he hoped and understood that Mr Syme's motion included this hybrid and equivocal class of practitioners.

in form and appearance homœopathic, but used by them without the slightest deliberation (*quid-quid in buccam venit*), and who, when the unsuitable remedy does not immediately give relief, in place of laying the blame on their unpardonable indolence and laxity in performing the most important and serious of all human affairs, ascribe it to homœopathy, which they accuse of great imperfection; if the truth be told, its imperfections consist in this, that the most suitable homœopathic remedy for each morbid condition, does not spontaneously fly into their mouths like roasted pigeons, without any trouble on their own part. They know, however (Hahnemann continues), how from frequent practice to make up for the inefficiency of the scarcely half homœopathic remedy, by the employment of allopathic means, that come much more handy to them, among which one or more dozens of leeches applied to the affected part, or little harmless venesections to the extent of eight ounces, and so forth, act an important figure; and should the patient, in spite of all this, recover, they extol their venesections, leeches, &c., alleging that had it not been for these, the patient would not have been brought through, and they give us to understand, in no doubtful language, that these operations, derived, without much exercise of genius, from the pernicious routine of the old school, in reality contributed the best share towards the cure; but if the patient die under the treatment, as not unfrequently happens, they seek to console the friends by saying that 'they themselves were witnesses that every thing conceivable had been done for the lamented deceased.' Who (adds Hahnemann) would do this frivolous and pernicious tribe the honour to call them after the name of the very laborious but salutary art, Homœopathic physicians?" *Organon*, p. 231; see also pp. 169 and 206.

And in the Preface to the last edition of this work, Hahnemann further remarks,—"That some erring physicians, who would wish to be considered homœopaths, engraft some, to them more convenient, allopathic bad practices, upon their nominally homœopathic treatment, is owing to ignorance of the doctrine, laziness, contempt for suffering humanity, and ridiculous conceit; and, in addition to unpardonable negligence in searching for the best homœopathic specific for each case of disease, has often a base love of gain, and other dishonourable motives, for its spring. And for its result?—That they cannot cure all important and serious diseases (which pure and careful homœopathy can), and that they send many of their patients to that place whence no one returns, whilst the friends console themselves with the reflection, that everything (including every hurtful allopathic process) has been done for the departed."—*Preface to the Fifth Edition of Organon*, p. xiii.

CHAPTER III.

NOTES ON THE PECULIAR THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS OF SOME OF HAHNEMANN'S DISCIPLES.—ITCH-CURSE AND CURE.—MORAL AND RELIGIOUS SYMPTOMS PRODUCED AND CURED BY SOME HOMŒOPATHIC DRUGS.

AFTER duly denouncing the “old school physicians” as using a *materia medica* “founded mainly on conjecture and false deductions mixed up with falsehood and fraud,”—as employing in chronic diseases “medicines and prescriptions capable (says he) of producing God knows what morbid state,” (p. 139),—and as guilty in their practice of “cruelty towards their sick fellow-creatures,” &c. &c., Hahnemann observes, in relation to his own supposed discovery and mission, “It was *high time* for the wise and benevolent Creator and Preserver of mankind to put a stop to this abomination, (and) to command a cessation of these tortures,” &c. And, at the end of a long section of declamations, he again adds,—“It *was* high time that He should permit the discovery of homœopathy.”—(*Organon*, p. 55).

At page 11, I have already stated that, apparently in consonance with these ideas, “some homœopathsists profess Hahnemann to have been inspired.” In one of the latest works on homœopathy (*Doctrine de l'Ecole de Rio, &c., Contenant une Exposition Methodique de l'Homœopathie*), published in Paris in 1849 (à l'Institut Homœopathique), Hahnemann is spoken of as “a messenger from heaven,”¹ as “the new evangelist,” and as “the most inspired of discoverers (*le plus inspiré de revelateurs*)” sent to render

¹ I have already cited in a previous page (see Chapter I., p. 4), the strong *oath* which Dr Mure describes as imposed by himself and his colleagues, on the medical students whom they licensed as practitioners of Homœopathy. On that occasion, after the students had made their profession of homœopathic faith, taken the oath, &c., Dr Mure, as President of the School, publicly pronounced their liberty to practise in the following affectedly sacred terms:—

“In the *name* of Hahnemann, discoverer of Homœopathy, from whom I have received the mission and the power, and with the assistance of my coadjutors, the disciples of that *messenger from heaven*, I now declare you fit to exercise the new art, acknowledge you as my colleagues, and as professors of pure Homœopathy.”—*British Journal of Homœopathy for 1849*, Vol. VII., p. 537.

medicine, like the other sciences, properly Christian. "Through him, Christian science became universal; and redemption descended from the dominion of sentiment to that of the ideas and of intelligence."

The author of the work in which these statements occur, Dr Mure, is described in the *British Journal of Homœopathy*,¹ edited by Drs Russell, Drysdale, and Dudgeon, as "the indefatigable APOSTLE of homœopathy." This "*Apostle of homœopathy*" (to use the term thus gratefully bestowed upon him by his English homœopathic brethren) declares in the work in question, that "homœopathy is not a science merely, but also, for those who comprehend it, a sublime devotion, a *form of religion*, a rainbow of divine union, holding out to mankind the promise of speedy regeneration." That this regeneration, however, might be accomplished, it was necessary, argues the author, that a victim as an expiatory sacrifice should be offered up, "to conquer the indifference of the vulgar, who demanded the crucifixion of Christ and the release of Barabbas." "God (he adds) willed that this expiatory victim should be born upon the steps of a throne." . . . "God (says he) willed that a whole nation, that an entire world, should have its eyes turned on him, so that the news of this unlooked-for death might inform all, that humanity was about to make a mighty step in advance." This expiatory victim "for the *Physical Redemption of mankind*" was, he proceeds to prove, the Prince Alphonso, heir-apparent to the Imperial throne of Brazil, who died a few days after birth, from being given to a consumptive nurse, and for want, as the author alleges, of proper homœopathic advice. "It seems (he concludes) that it is only by an excess of evil that man can return to good. In order that humanity should renounce the worship of false gods, nothing less than a DEICIDE² was necessary. It is by a REGICIDE² that allopathy behoved to mark its last hour." . . . "A peal of thunder," states this so-called APOSTLE, "betokened the birth of him elected by God for this great mission. . . . Nothing could prevail against the efforts of the Most High. The Prince Alphonso was destined to perish, and we to bear witness to his death, in order that it might prove more useful to the world than has been the life of the greatest Monarch."

¹ See a sketch of the Apostle's life and doings in this Journal for 1849, p. 530.

² These two words are thus printed in capitals in the original.

But “a *finishing* character was (writes Dr Mure) wanting to the new art (of homœopathy),—the character of the Infinite. It (the character of the Infinite) forms (he adds) the certain mark of the reform being accomplished under Christian influence; all the sciences of the past are limited and material; those of the future all carry man to the idea of the Infinite, and allow us to witness the Omnipresent image of the Divinity.” Hence, forsooth, according to this Apostle, the *Infinitesimal* character of the doses used by homœopaths,—“that discovery which forms the most beautiful gem in the immortal crown of Hahnemann.”¹

¹ Hahnemann himself gives another explanation of the use of the infinitesimal division of drugs, viz., that it produces “a real SPIRITUALISATION of the dynamic property” of each drug—(P. 823). “But (says he) the mode of attenuating practised in homœopathy, effects not only an equal distribution of the medicinal drop throughout a great proportional quantity of unmedicinal fluid, but it also happens—and this is of infinitely greater importance—that by the succussion and trituration employed, a change is effected in the mixture, which is so *incredibly great*, and so *inconceivably curative*, that this development of the SPIRITUAL power of medicines to such a height, by means of the multiplied and continued trituration and succussion of a small portion of medicinal substance with ever more and more dry or fluid unmedicinal substances, deserves incontestibly to be reckoned among the greatest discoveries of this age.”—*The Lesser Writings of Hahnemann*, p. 818. Edited by Dr Dudgeon.

The “Apostle of Homœopathy,” Dr Mure, tells us, in the work alluded to in the text, that, besides the very solemn Oath already quoted at p. 4, amongst the nine articles of the homœopathic creed which the graduates of the school over which he presided, are obliged to subscribe, are the two following:—

“I believe that all substances in nature, even those regarded as the most inert, possess the power of acting on the vital dynamism, because all contain a *spiritual* principle which they derive from God.

“I believe it to be a sacred duty for every man, and particularly every Christian, to submit himself to pure experimentation, as far as his health admits of it, remembering that our divine Redeemer consented to suffer an ignominious death on the cross, to redeem us from sin, and to obtain for us eternal happiness.”—*British Journal of Homœopathy*, Vol. VII., p. 535, 536.

In an Editorial semi-religious essay in the “Family Herald” for November 2, 1850, homœopathy is held up to the English public as a kind of passage from the sovereignty of matter to that of spirit,—“Religion itself,” says the writer, “has undergone a spiritual revolution since the date of Hahnemann’s discovery. . . . The tendency of homœopathy is so decidedly *spiritual*, that it naturally leads its possessors, in spite of themselves, into mystic and religious feelings. How is it possible for a man to escape them, when he becomes convinced from experience that the less material his medicine becomes, the more efficacious it proves? ‘The less matter the more *spirit*,’ is its admitted maxim; and if this do not tend to make a spiritualist of a man, we know not what will. . . . It is the *spirit* that cureth, and *spirit* is not to be measured in value by the amount of the body that contains it. . . . Such (observes the writer) is the reasoning of homœopathy, and the analogy is *very beautiful*!” &c. &c.

Such painful suggestions and wild statements are not limited to the homœopathic literature of France. Guided by a similar spirit, some English homœopathists have anxiously attempted to show that the doctrines and practices of Hahnemann are duly foreshadowed in Scripture. During the past year, a sermon was preached in London by a clergyman of the Church of England, the Rev. Thomas R. Everest, Rector of Wickwar, Gloucestershire, in aid of the Hahnemann Hospital: and has been subsequently published. The sermon is replete with Hahnemannic theology, as well as Hahnemannic medicine. The reverend author, who boasts of "some years of intimacy" with Hahnemann, conceives it was not likely that "the sacred pages of the Word of God should be *quite silent* on the subject" of the discoveries which his friend imagined he had made some nineteen centuries afterwards. And accordingly he finds they are not "silent." One of Hahnemann's supposed highest and greatest generalizations in pathology was, the dogma or doctrine that about seven-eighths of all the chronic diseases of the men and women of this and other ages were the result of the unobserved and unknown presence of *Psora*, or (to use its plain English synonym) Itch, and were to be cured by the remedies capable of curing Itch.¹ But, argues the Rev. Rector of Wickwar, our Saviour

¹ Hahnemann, in his *Organon* (p. 183), tells us that he spent twelve years of his life in tracing the origin of an "incredibly large number of chronic affections" to their true source, namely, Itch.—"This thousand-headed monster of disease," as he terms it, "does," to quote his own words, "after the completion of the internal infection of the whole organism, announce by a peculiar cutaneous eruption, sometimes consisting only of a few vesicles, accompanied by intolerable voluptuous tickling itching (and a peculiar odour), the monstrous internal chronic miasm—the psora, the only real fundamental cause and producer of all the other numerous, I may say, innumerable, forms of disease, which under the names of Nervous Debility, Hysteria, Hypochondriasis, Mania, Melancholia, Imbecility, Madness, Epilepsy, and Convulsions of all sorts, of Softening of the Bones (Rachitis), Scoliosis and Cyphosis, Caries, Cancer, Fungus, Hæmatodes, Malignant Organic Growths, Gout, Hæmorrhoids, Jaundice, Cyanosis, Dropsy, Amenorrhœa, Hæmorrhage from the Stomach, Nose, Lungs, Bladder, and Womb, of Asthma, and Ulceration of the Lungs, of Impotence and Barrenness, of Megrims, Deafness, Cataract, Amaurosis, Urinary Calculus, Paralysis, Defects of the Senses, and Pains of thousands of kinds, &c., figure in systematic works on pathology as peculiar independent diseases."—(P. 183.) Hahnemann tried to trace some acute diseases also to *Psora*. "No one (says he) free from *Psora*, ever gets inflammation of the lungs."—*Lesser Writings*, p. 831.

Mr Everest's own fanciful enumeration of the moral, religious, political, and physical results in mankind of the presence of Itch or Leprosy in the human constitution, is perhaps still more extensive and comprehensive than that of Hahnemann; and he tells us he could adduce many proofs derived from his (Mr Everest's) own experience,

actually meant the cure of Itch (that fertile source of human disease and suffering), when he issued "the solemn command to his disciples," "*cleanse the lepers*" (Matt. x. 7, 8); the leprosy of the New Testament and the *psora* or itch of Hahnemann being, according to

of the truth of Hahnemann's doctrine of the dreadful consequences of the taint of Itch or leprosy. "The taint (says he) is, as Scripture *has* hinted, and investigation *has* with- in these few years shown, the parent of all these chronic tendencies, these Cachexias, these Scrofulas, these Atrophies, this Sterility, this Atony, this Gout, this Rheumatism, this Phthisis, this hereditary Insanity with all its hydra heads and multiform shapes and shades, dark Passions, furious Lusts, stubborn Obstinacies, scowling Tempers, suicidal Manias, gloomy Revenges, gnawing Jealousies, Fretfulness, Ill-humour; in short, all the various aberrations of mind, and reluctance to bear patiently the burdens which the Lord lays on man. All these chronic tendencies to disorder do combine and interlace with the natural corruption, the taint derived from Adam; and who, save God alone, shall say where one begins, and the other ends? The tendency to disorder of the functions aggravates the tendency to sin. The chronic taint in the constitution increases the chronic proneness to sin which Adam left us. The physical leprosy of the flesh unites with the moral leprosy of the soul. It is this combination of the two, aided often by stimuli, and almost always by large doses of violent inappropriate medicines antecedently given (medicines which a child may put into the constitution, but which ten men could not get out of it again), which festers in your gaols, rots in your hulks, seethes in your lanes and alleys, and bubbles up in crime, madness, and eccentricity all over your land. This it is which makes your atheist on the one hand, your bigot on the other. This it is which feeds the flame of folly everywhere all over the earth, placed Simon on his pillar, sent the world on crusades, lights the Suttee :—nay, why travel eastward! which here in this our own land, gave disciples to Johanna Southcote, creates Mormons,—peoples Agapemone, begets holy jackets and bleeding pictures,—and confounds God's reasonable heritage with crime—guilt—lust—passion—disease—distress—lunacy—folly—idiocy."—P. 39 of Mr Everest's *Sermon*.

Surely, among the many wild and strange medical theories that have, during the last two or three thousand years, been broached and forgotten by enthusiasts, none was ever at least wilder or stranger than this Hahnemannian fancy regarding Itch and its supposed ill consequences. Itch is now generally recognised and acknowledged to consist of a species of inflammation of the skin, produced there by the burrowing and presence of an insect and its products (the *Acarus Scabiei*). "Now-a-days it is generally believed by the best observers, that the *Acarus* alone can produce the itch." (*Journal of Homœopathy* for 1849, p. 357.) And if man, through cleanliness and appropriate washes, &c., clears his skin from the presence of this filthy insect, he becomes, forsooth, the victim of the diversified diseases described in the preceding paragraphs! What a sad satire upon cleanliness and hygiene. Nor is this absurd doctrine rendered less absurd by the excuse brought forward in extenuation of it by some homœopaths, viz., that Hahnemann was not the original inventor and has not been the sole supporter of this medical hypothesis. In fact, Hahnemann had changed his own opinion on the matter. For in the early part of his career he attributed to the drinking and use of *coffee* a vast number of those chronic diseases which he latterly so dogmatically attributed to *Itch*. (See *Journal of Homœopathy* for 1849, p. 352.)

Mr Everest's own grand discovery, quite identical. Of course, according to this new Hahnemannian theology, all our learned theologians have hitherto been in error in supposing, that the verse in which this phrase occurs ("And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, *cleanse the lepers*, raise the dead, cast out devils") included a warrant of miraculous gifts to the first disciples, for the purpose of their testifying to men the truth of the great mission intrusted to them. Why (argues Mr Everest) was leprosy picked out among the ills of man? "Why not blindness?" He forgets that blindness is enumerated in another parallel passage in evidence of the same divine power of miracle-working on the part of our Saviour himself. "The *blind* receive their sight, the lame walk, *the lepers are cleansed*, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matt. xi. 5). Maundrell, one of our earliest English travellers in Palestine, when speaking of the leprosy, which he still saw, in the 17th century, lingering among some inhabitants of the Holy Land, describes "the distemper as so noisome that it mighte well passe for the utmost corruption of the human bodie on this side the grave." Its revolting and hopeless character was well known to the Jews from the experience of ages; and Christ, indeed, could not have manifested his own divine power and mission more strongly than by miraculously curing so incurable a malady, and by bestowing the same gift upon his disciples.

"Irreligion (maintains Mr Everest), is the daughter of internal disorder," or disease; but "the old system" of medicine did not properly remove disordered action, and hence "was (to use his own words) of no use or value as an aid to conversion;" whilst he conceives that by appropriate homœopathic treatment, clergymen may expect to obtain great assistance in their spiritual work among their flocks. If the psoric taint were completely eradicated, the consequence, he maintains, would be, that "the holy and saving truths of the Gospel then will be admitted into the heart, and *never* fail, then, to influence the life."¹ Without, in short, stating it in as many

¹ Hahnemann's experience, however, was not apparently always in consonance with Mr Everest's theory. For, in a note to one of his sections on the effects and cure of *psora*, he thus complains;—"How often do we not meet with a mild, soft disposition in patients who have for years been afflicted with the most painful diseases, so that the physician feels constrained to esteem and compassionate the sufferer! But if he *subdue* the disease, and restore the patient to *health*—as is frequently done

words, Mr Everest,—amidst much characteristic verbiage and declamation,—conveys to the minds of his readers the idea that sin, or at least man's persistence in sin, and repulsion of gospel truth, is the result of the innate *physical* deformity or disorder of the human body, rather than the result of the innate *moral* deformity and wickedness of the human heart, or of both combined; but further, this physical disorder—consisting, as it does, merely of *Psora* or Itch and its consequences,—is removable by appropriate medical anti-psoric treatment; and he believes that the reception of Divine truth for conviction and conversion may, and should, be artificially promoted by globulising homœopathically, children and others, not “*when people are sick, but before that,*” for thus (again to use his own words) by a “continuous [homœopathic] treatment, begun in childhood, we may hope to anticipate disorders, to restore harmony, to combat the internal *psoric* tendencies, and to procure a patient hearing and kindly reception of spiritual ministrations.” . . . “When the old system” (of physis) “shall have quite vanished from the earth, and the new one (homœopathic) shall be established, *then, for the first time,* will the Gospel of the kingdom of grace be preached as Jesus ordered it to be preached, and received as God intended it to be received.” (See *Sermon preached in the Church of St Augustin, Cheapside, April 9th, 1851, by the Rev. Thomas R. Everest*; London, published by Alyott and Jones, booksellers).

I regret to add, that the homœopathic orthodoxy of Mr Everest's Hahnemannic Theology has been so far sanctioned and homologated by his homœopathic brethren in England, that the sermon in question was publicly preached in aid of the funds of the London Hahnemann Hospital; Mr Everest having been nominated for that purpose by, he tells us, the kind partiality of the Hospital Board of Management. The reverend author is himself a Vice-President in the directory of the same hospital; and the fly-leaf of his sermon bears the names of various noblemen, gentlemen, and homœopathic physicians, as office-bearers along with him in the management of the institution which was to reap the pecuniary benefits

in homœopathic practice—he is often astonished and horrified at the frightful alteration in his disposition. He often witnesses the occurrence of ingratitude, cruelty, refined malice, and propensities most disgraceful and degrading to humanity, which were exactly the qualities possessed by the patient before he grew ill.”—*Hahnemann's Organon*. Fifth Edition. P. 265. When Hahnemann, therefore, cured *Psora*, he produced, by the cure of it, some of the very mental states which Mr Everest describes as the results of the want of cure of this disease.

accruing from the delivery of this medico-theological statement and appeal of his to the "mothers," the "fathers," the "religious public," the "religious body of *this* land," and the "governors of God's heritage, monarels, parliaments, and magistrates." The day after this sermon was preached, the managers and friends of the Hahnemann Hospital, and some of the principal homœopathists of London, dined together, under the presidency of Lord Grosvenor. And at this dinner, Mr Everest's sermon was publicly declared to be a "giant addition to the homœopathic literature of this country. (Cheers.)"¹ A few days afterwards, the Editor of the *Homœopathic Times*, in a long and laudatory review of Mr Everest's sermon, observes,—“His admirable discourse in respect of logic was faultless; sometimes grave in censure, sometimes severe in Christian simplicity, sometimes thrilling in pathos. *In short, it was a great achievement.* The discourse must, of course, be forthwith published; and we trust it will be distributed by tens of thousands.” (*Homœopathic Times* for April 12, 1851, p. 514.)

A late discovery of Dr Mure may perhaps greatly interest poor Mr Everest, and those who fancy with him that *psora* or itch forms one of the great obstructions to spiritual conversion. Dr Mure announces this discovery (see his *Pathogenesie*, pp. 129 to 141) with, he states, “a feeling of inward satisfaction” (*le sentiment de satisfaction intime*), and a conviction that he renders by it “a real service to the practice and theory of medicine.” This new and grand specific for *psora*, and especially for *hereditary psora* (the very thing required), consists of homœopathic doses of a species of animal which, observes Dr Mure, “it is unnecessary to describe at length, the animal being sufficiently known,”—namely, the human louse, “*le pou sur la tête des enfans*,” or “*Pediculus capitis*.”² Dr Mure

¹ See Speech of Mr Leaf, in “*Homœopathic Times*” for April 12, 1851, p. 517.

² Doses of another insect had previously been used for the homœopathic treatment of *Psora*. Persons affected with itch have (as is now well known to physicians), a small insect (the *Acarus Scabiei*) imbedded in their diseased skins in the vicinity of the eruptions. These small insects, picked from the skins of patients affected with itch, are, it appears, after being triturated with sugar of milk, administered as an internal remedy in that disorder, on the principle *similia similibus curantur*.—(*Pharmaceutical Journal* for 1851, Vol. x. p. 382.) On the same principle Dr Hering, one of the most distinguished American homœopathists, recommends swallowing “bugs in the 30th dilution” for curing the inflammation arising from bug-bites. “The ex-

found that doses of lice, or lice-tea, were capable of creating 283 different symptoms in the stomach, head, chest, bowels, skin, &c., &c. To the description of these symptoms he devotes twelve pages, and his conclusion is that the effects of this new medicinal homœopathic agent were altogether such as to show it to be a marvellous specific for the removal of *psora*.¹ May we expect a report from the Rector of Wickwar and his clerico-medical followers as to the extent to which they find continuous doses of the *Pediculus* when administered to their congregations an aid to their "spiritual conversion"?²

Only think of Dr Wiseman, or Dr Hugh M'Neile, Dr Candlish, or Mr Drummond, attempting to render their spiritual ministrations more efficacious to their flocks by asking them, as Mr Everest

anthemata should be combated in the same way; cholera patients should swallow the matters they ejected, potentized (or duly prepared); yellow fever patients should be treated in like manner; the scales of scarlatina should be used as a prophylactic against that disease; and typhus patients should have milk sugar laid on their skin to catch the typhus virus, which was to be used as an anti-typhus remedy. Hering called this treatment by *similima*, not *æqualia*; and Hahnemann says the same. (*Chron. Krank.* Vol. i. p. 188.) "Leucorrhœa was cured by potentized leucorrhœal matter," &c., and the expectoration of consumption given to phthisical patients. See further details of isopathic remedies in a Sketch of the Progressive Development of the Homœopathic System, in the "Journal of Homœopathy" for 1849, p. 337. Drs Tietze, Schnappauf, Rummel, and others, have latterly treated patients labouring under small-pox with doses of the matter of small-pox and cow-pox.—(*Ibid.* for 1851, p. 470 and 504.)

¹ "Avant de commencer cette expérience, nous en attendions des résultats importants. Nous pensions que la nature, en multipliant le Pou sur la tête des enfants, indiquait d'avance un spécifique de la psore héréditaire. Nous savions aussi que le *Psorinum* développait la pityriase chez l'homme sain. Cette coïncidence merveilleuse, cette double démonstration, ne pouvait être trompeuse. Nous avons, en effet, trouvé dans *Pediculus* un agent des plus utiles dans les maladies de l'enfance, et, de plus, un des termes extrêmes de la série symptomatologique que nous avons ébauchée, et que sans lui nous eussions eu, sans doute, beaucoup de peine à formuler. Sous ce double rapport, nous pensons avoir rendu un service réel à la pratique et à la théorie de notre art. Ceux qui se livrent à ces patientes recherches peuvent seuls comprendre le sentiment de satisfaction intime qui accompagne une pareille conviction."—*Doctrine de l'Ecole de Rio*, &c.,—contenant une *Exposition Methodique de l'Homœopathie*, &c. p. 129.

² Last March, there was ominously advertised in the *Homœopathic Times*, as existing in Mr Everest's parish of Wickwar, a "Homœopathic Preparatory Establishment for Young Ladies." The tenor of the advertisement would seem to show, that this was a boarding-house or school. (See *Homœopathic Times* for March 15, 1851).

proposes, to get themselves properly drugged and prepared for the reception of gospel truth by due doses of anti-psoric globules! ¹

Too true, alas! is the trite remark, that, for centuries past, the promoters of almost all varieties of human folly have, by forced explanations of one text or other of the Bible, attempted to defend and justify their own peculiar type of foolishness.

¹ The homœopathic list of drugs includes a number of medicines that possess (at least according to the homœopathists) the power of producing, and hence, on the principle "*similia similibus curantur*," of curing, various moral and religious symptoms and states. Thus, according to Jahr (vide *Manual of Homœopathic Medicine*, vol. i.), the great anti-psoric remedy, SULPHUR (p. 563), produces in a healthy person, and hence will cure in a diseased, the feeling of "Despair of Eternal Salvation;" LYCOPodium (p. 337) possesses the same property; a dose of PULSATILLA (p. 468) produces "Despair of Eternal Happiness, with continual praying," "hymns, and Devout Aspect;" LACHESIS (p. 310) produces, and hence should cure, "Absence of Religious Feeling, and fear of approaching death;" a small dose of GOLD, taken internally, produces "Excessive Scruples of Conscience," and "Despair of One's self and others;" VERATRUM produces "extraordinary taciturnity, with Oaths on the slightest provocation," and "Raving about Religious Matters;" ACONITE (p. 3) Produces "an irresistible desire to Blaspheme and Swear," and "a sensation as if the mind was separated from the body;" ANACARDIUM (p. 33) Produces the same swearing symptoms, and "absence of all Moral and Religious feelings" (vol. ii., p. 155); a dose of common COLOCYNTH (an ingredient in an allopathic pill which most people have repeatedly swallowed) produces (says Jahr, p. 189) "Want of all Religious Feeling," &c. &c. &c.

CHAPTER IV.

STATE OF HOMŒOPATHY IN GERMANY, ETC.—NUMBER OF HOMŒOPATHIC PUPILS AT VIENNA HOSPITALS.—ITS PATRONAGE BY SOME LAYMEN OF TALENT.

IN the preceding speech, I have incidentally stated (p. 11) that the religious Mormonite doctrines of Joseph Smith, and the medical Homœopathic doctrines of Samuel Hahnemann, were two heresies which were both extending;¹ “but that was no evidence of the value of either.” This observation, however just as regards the prospects of homœopathy among the “very rich, but always very credulous and very dupable, people of England,” does not seem to hold equally true with regard to the latter course and history of homœopathy on the Continent of Europe. In “Bradshaw’s Guide to the Continent,” published a few months ago (August 1851), the author, Mr Lee, who, “by repeated visits and residences” upon the Continent, has made himself specially intimate with its medical and other institutions, incidentally makes the following observations regarding the present state of homœopathy in its native country of Germany, and the condition of it in Leipsic at the time of his last visit to that city:—

“At the time,” he observes (pp. 290 and 291), “of my first visit, I was anxious to see the Homœopathic Hospital, of which I had previously heard, Leipsic being the head-quarters of this doctrine. I expected to have found at least forty or fifty beds filled with patients; but was rather surprised to find that the building (which is a small house in the suburbs) only contained eight, and even of these all but two or three were unoccupied. At my last visit to Leipsic, I understood that matters were going on badly with homœopathy, which indeed is now comparatively little heard of in Germany and France, except at Vienna, and only requires to be understood by the public for its absurdity to be apparent, though there will always be credulous individuals who are to be caught by any novelty, when presented

¹ On the rapid and recent extension of Mormonism (“the only State Church in America”), see an interesting volume, entitled “The Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints,” lately published in the Illustrated National Library.

under a specious appearance, and backed by an unintelligible name. During its whole progress, it never was sanctioned by any individual of eminence in the profession,¹ and was principally taken up as a means of acquiring wealth or a livelihood, by persons who had never been previously heard of, or who were known as having failed to acquire practice by the honourable exercise of their profession, by whom every means were taken to puff it into notice, and to keep public attention directed to it; such as repeated histories of cures, the establishment of dispensaries, of which, I believe, the only one that remains is the above-mentioned at Leipsic, even if that be still in existence; for a few months before my arrival, the house-physician having become convinced, during a residence of some time in the dispensary, of the nullity and danger of homœopathy, gave up his appointment, and published an exposition of the system pursued,² with an account of cases, which clearly shows (what had

¹ "Homœopathists (observes Dr Hooker) often boast of the inroads which their system has made upon the ranks of the medical profession. But it is an empty boast. If the homœopathic physicians in this country could be gathered together, it would be an assemblage, for the most part, of very common men. No superior order of talent would be found among them. There would be none who are distinguished for true research; none who have made any respectable additions to the literature of medicine, or to its store of experience; and none who have ever had any commanding influence. There would be some, indeed, who are reputed among homœopathists to be great men; but none who, previous to their conversion to homœopathy, were considered great by the medical profession. A large portion of that assemblage, I am persuaded from what I have seen, would be made up of men who have no true faith in the so-called science of homœopathy, but have a strong faith in the *deception* which can be practised by means of it upon the community, and its consequent availability in a *pecuniary* point of view. Those who have such a strange cast of mind, as to dupe themselves into a belief of homœopathic doctrines, after a thorough and scientific examination of them, I suspect would be in the minority."—*Dr Hooker's Physician and Patient*, p. 142. New York, 1849.

Dr Mühry of Hanover, writing regarding the homœopathic physicians of Germany, remarks,—“I do not hesitate to say that, although men of worth are to be found amongst them, there prevails, generally speaking, both within and without the profession, a low opinion of the standard of their intelligence. In Germany, no man of undoubted eminence has ever become a convert to the system. Only once has an instance like that . . . occurred: Dr Kopp, of Hanau, unexpectedly published a volume of ‘Practical Observations,’ descriptive of a series of homœopathic cases and cures of his own witnessing. He thus stamped himself a homœopathist. A few years afterwards, another volume of the ‘Observations’ appeared, communicating a further series of cases and cures,—but of an allopathic nature. The author thus declared himself re-converted, and he has remained so ever since.”—*Dr Forbes' British and Foreign Medical Review* for 1846. Vol. xxii., p. 566.

² “Ueber die Nichtigkeit der Homœopathie. (*On the Nothingness of Homœopathy.*) Leipsic, 1840.”

long been evident to the bulk of the profession and the public) that the so-called cures were recoveries from ordinary ailments by the efforts of nature, which were frequently a long time under treatment; whereas, by a proper medication and attention at the outset, they might probably have been removed in a few days; and that many of the more serious cases got worse instead of better, for the want of active treatment. It must not be supposed that the homœopathsists always adhere to the principles of the doctrine. It has not unfrequently happened, that persons who attributed their recovery to homœopathy, were treated allopathically without their being aware of it. In fact, one practitioner in Leipsic, a professed homœopathist, candidly acknowledged that he pursued both plans of treatment, and was accustomed to ask his patients by which method they would be treated, as both were equally good.”¹

¹ “The fate of the Duke di Cannizzaro, well known some years ago in London as the Count St Antonio, is an exemplification of this. Having to take homœopathic globules at intervals for some slight ailment, in order to save trouble he took three doses at once, and died two hours afterwards; the supposed globules being a concentrated preparation of *nux vomica*.”

I have been told that a strong homœopathic convert, who read the first edition of this pamphlet, gravely maintains, that this case of the Duke of Cannizzaro, as told by Mr Lee, fully proves, that all our reasoning about the inefficacy of infinitesimal doses is evidently wrong, seeing they may be so potent as even to poison a man. It is, however, I believe, almost quite unnecessary to add, that the Duke was *not* poisoned by infinitesimal doses of *nux vomica* in the globules; but by these globules having been fraudulently made up by the attendant physician, so as to contain doses of *nux vomica*, or rather strychnia, larger than any allopath even would use,—a kind of fraud which homœopathists have been detected practising upon their credulous patients also in this country. (On homœopathic globules, powders, &c., drugged with large doses of morphia, mercury, &c.—See the *Medical Gazette* for 1847, p. 294; *Lancet* for 1850, p. 300; *Pharmaceutical Journal* for 1851, p. 318.) Dr Taylor, the distinguished toxicologist and chemist of Guy’s Hospital, found one-third of a grain of morphia in a powder *professedly* homœopathic and infinitesimal. I was informed, last summer, by Dr Horace Green, of New York, of another instance of death, from a gentleman swallowing, in sport, a number of homœopathic globules, which, on examination afterwards, were found drugged, not with infinitesimal and innocent, but with large and poisonous doses of strychnia. And a small dose of this acute poison might suffice. A dose of strychnia, (the essential principle of *nux vomica*), amounting only to half a grain, has proved fatal, within a quarter of an hour, to an adult.

The Author of the “Confessions of an Homœopathist,” in referring to the due and adequate drugging of the Hahnemannian doses, amusingly remarks:—“Patients who are sceptical of the truths of homœopathy, from a love of variety, or a hundred other reasons, will consult you. As these persons are inclined to ridicule infinitesimal doses, it is sometimes highly useful to give them powerful doses of various highly concentrated medicines, in globules similar in appearance to all the

Within the last few weeks I have been informed by Dr George Fleming of Dundee, who has just returned from a six months' sojourn at Vienna, that he attended the Homœopathic Hospital there, under Dr Wurm, for upwards of a month, but that matters did not seem to go on prosperously with homœopathy even in that school, which is acknowledged to be its central and chief seat. The whole number of pupils in attendance at the Hospital only amounted to five. The diseases of the patients were chiefly of a chronic and subacute type, with numerous cases of a prevailing mucons fever, which was so slight as not to require formal medical treatment. Only one case of acute inflammatory disease was admitted,—viz., a case of pneumonia of four days' standing. This patient died.

There is a second and older Homœopathic Hospital at Gumpendorf, in the suburbs of Vienna, under the medical charge of Dr Fleischmann. When Dr Fleming was at Vienna, he was assured that there was only one medical pupil attending Dr Fleischmann's Hospital. His informant was the pupil himself. Speaking of Fleischmann's Hospital, Dr Routh, who some time ago studied at Vienna, remarks, "I never saw, at any one time, more than two students in attendance, besides the physician going round."

In a letter lying before me, from Dr Gerson, a very intelligent young German physician, who has studied at various continental schools, and has lately come on a visit to Edinburgh, it is stated, "During the last six or eight years, neither the medical profession nor the public of Germany have paid any degree of attention to homœopathy, for it is now everywhere looked upon as possessing no theoretical or practical value. It is tolerated, because it is regarded as a very innocent and harmless species of quackery. . . . As regards actual homœopathic practice in Germany, it is very limited indeed. In Leipsie, where the English and other admirers of Hahnemann have lately erected a statue of him, and which was once

rest, but consisting of morphia, strychnine, arsenic, corrosive sublimate, and such like : a few of these mingled with your sugar and starch globules will cause effects to be felt by the septic which will quickly overcome his disbelief : he generally makes an excellent patient, and often a good decoy-duck. Never scruple in paralytic cases to give strychnine largely, but never allow it to be supposed that you are giving more at a dose than the one-hundred-thousandth of a grain. This rule may be followed in other complaints with other very active drugs, such as croton oil ; but this is one of our profoundest secrets, and must be kept so. Were it known, our wonder-working powers would be reduced in the estimation of the public and the regulars."—P. 197.

the chief seat, if not the birth-place, of Homœopathy, out of 120 medical men, there are now, as I was lately informed by Dr Radius, the Professor of Clinical Medicine in the University of that city, only six or seven homœopathists, and only two or three of this number can be said to be engaged in practice, and to a limited extent. The Homœopathic Hospital which existed formerly in Leipsic has become defunct. In Hamburg, out of 183 medical men, there is now only one homœopathist. The son of this gentleman has entered the medical profession, but has not adopted the homœopathic principles of his father. A physician who formerly practised homœopathy in Hamburg, renounced it some years ago, and returned to legitimate medicine."

While this sheet was passing through the press, Dr Oscar Prieger of Kreuznach, a physician well known to many English invalids who have of late years visited the Continent, came to Edinburgh; and, on showing him Dr Gerson's letter, he confirmed to me, in the strongest manner, the recent rapid decline, or indeed total extinction, of homœopathy in the cities and medical schools along the Rhine, and in all that part of Germany with which he was acquainted. In fact, he had heard the word only in England, or from English patients, during the last five or six years,—the delusion having now altogether ceased to excite any interest in the districts of Germany with which he was intimate. Like other pseudo-sciences which we have from time to time received from our German neighbours, it has found a temporary asylum in England, after it had been comparatively discarded from its native soil,—the "mental epidemic," necessary for its spread, extending to this island, after having passed over, and in a great degree ceased, on the Continent.

It has been occasionally argued, that there must be some truth in homœopathy, because, in our own country, some few men of talent, not conversant with medicine,¹ or connected with the medical profession, have, from time to time, swallowed Hahnemannian doses, or

¹ Dr Whately, in the Preface to his work on Logic, remarks:—"A sailor will perhaps despise the pretensions of medical men, and prefer treating a disease by common sense; but he would ridicule the proposal of navigating a ship by common sense, without regard to the maxims of nautical art." Dr Whately's remark, no doubt, applies to Archbishops and others, as well as to sailors. In the work itself he correctly observes, "Nothing is more common than to hear a person state confidently, as from his own experience, that such and such a patient *was cured* by this or that medicine; whereas, all that he absolutely *knows* is, that he took the medicine, and that he recovered."—P. 231.

professed an adherence to the creed and doctrines of homœopathy. But, alas! laymen of the highest intellects have, in the history of the world, very often formed, for the time, the highest abettors of almost every kind of transitory medical charlatanry. No child of the present day believes in the curative influence of the sympathetic salve applied,—not to the wound,—but to the weapon which made the wound. Lord Bacon himself, however, “the wisest of men,” confessed that he did not entirely discredit the efficacy of this sympathetic weapon-salve; or the healing powers of charms and amulets; and Roger Bacon was a believer in a Universal Elixir of Life. The Honorable Robert Boyle, one of the most distinguished philosophers and writers of his day, and a man who was deservedly elected President of the Royal Society, supposed that he cured himself of an ague by wearing a medicated bracelet around his wrist; he, “Cudworth the philosopher, and many other eminent men of unquestionable competency,” testified to the success of the supposed effects and cures produced by the exorcisms and manipulations of Valentine Greatrakes; and the Rev. J. Flamstead, the first Astronomer-Royal, made a voyage to Ireland, to be cured by a touch of the hand of this exorcist.¹ Dr Hartley, the celebrated metaphysician, published an octavo volume in favour of Mrs Stephen’s alleged specific for gravel and stone, with 150 cases in proof of its alleged efficacy, his own case being among the number; but he himself died of the very disease for which he had vaunted the discovery of an infallible cure, and of which he alleged himself to be cured. The British Parliament has very seldom voted any sums of public money for the advancement of medical science, or for the reward of medical discoveries; but, carried away by the epidemic enthusiasm of the day, they voted £5000 for the purchase of Mrs Stephen’s fanciful specific,—a permanent and public attestation of the medical credulity of the “chosen representatives of the intellect and intelligence of the people of England.”² “The public (very truly

¹ After stating, on his return, that his disease was not so violent as before, Flamstead naively adds, “But *whether*, through God’s mercy, I received this from Mr Greatrakes’ touch, or my journey and vomiting at sea, I am uncertain.” (See his Autobiography, in Bailey’s Account of him, p. 21.)

² The official publication of the composition of Mrs Stephen’s remedy in the *London Gazette* was speedily fatal to its reputation. “It consisted of egg-shells, and snail-shells with the snails in them, all calcined; ash-keys, hips and haws, swine-cress, and various other vegetables, all burned to a cinder; with chamomile flowers, fennel, and some other vegetables,—these last not being burned in the same manner.”

observes Dr Marshall Hall) have a strange idea of medicine—an idea little different from SUPERSTITION; there is for them nothing too trifling, not even Homœopathy; nothing too violent, not even the feats of Priessnitz and of St John Long;¹ nothing too absurd, from the royal touch, or that of a hanged man's hand,² down to Perkinism³ or Mesmerism.”

¹ “Mr Long was (says Dr Currie) a painter at Cork, who took up doctoring on his own authority, settled in London, took a fine house, and, maintaining the same doctrines as Hahnemann as to a morbid matter (only he did not name his ‘fundamental cause’ an internal psora), soon got abundance of patients. Hahnemann rejected *all* applications externally, and Long *used none else*; yet the latter, on his trial, was able to produce a long list of Nobility, Lawyers, &c. &c., who were his patients and patrons; and one of them, Lord Ingestrie, swore that he saw St J. Long draw several pounds of a liquid like mercury from a patient's brain.* Long died of the disease which he lived by curing, and the virtues of his remedy expired with him. He sold his secret to a lady of rank in this country for £3000; but, after various unavailing trials in her hands, it was soon forgotten.”—*Dublin Quarterly Journal* for 1846, p. 208.

² The hand of a hanged man was, when applied to a scrofulous sore, supposed to possess the *same* healing property as the touch of the reigning king of England,—a therapeutical association by no means very flattering to monarchy.

³ Through the kindness of Dr Tweedie, I am in possession of one of the original bills or advertisements of “Perkins' Patent Metallic Tractors,” and a specimen or set of the Tractors themselves—two small, tapering pieces of metal, one zinc and the other copper (?)—the manufacture of which would cost a few pence, but which were sold about fifty years ago, in great numbers, “at six guineas the set,” being then believed by many to be perfectly efficacious in the removal of (as the bill states) “Acute and Chronic Rheumatism, Gout, Sprains, Erysipelas, Epileptic fits, Pleurisy, &c. &c., and all analogous diseases of Horses and other animals.” In these and other diseases, the Tractors were declared then (exactly in the same words as homœopathy is declared now) to be a “safe, speedy, and effectual” method of cure. Persons of high repute and station bore, half a century ago, the highest testimony to the truths of Perkinism, as some of the same are ready to do at the present day to the truths of homœopathy. “Among the vouchers (says Mr Perkins) will be found eight professors in four Universities, in the various branches, as follows—three of Natural Philosophy, four of Medicine, one of Natural History; to these may be added nineteen Physicians, seventeen Surgeons, and twenty Clergymen, of whom ten are Doctors of Divinity, and many others of equal respectability.”

CHAPTER V.

INFINITESIMAL DOSES AND HOMŒOPATHY NECESSARILY CONNECTED TOGETHER IN PRACTICE; REASONS FOR USING THE SMALLEST DOSES; DISEASES AGGRAVATED BY LARGE DOSES.

AWARE of the absurdity implied in the allegation, that medicinal effects could possibly be produced by the billionths, decillionths, and other infinitesimal doses of drugs, some homœopathists have anxiously argued, that homœopathy is one thing, and the employment of these infinitesimal doses quite another. And it is no doubt true, that the alleged "universal," "immutable," homœopathic law, *similia similibus curantur*, might be true, altogether separate from, and independently of, the supposed therapeutic potency of the minute doses. But it is also equally true, that, according to Hahnemann himself, when he tried to treat diseases in accordance with the homœopathic law, but with the large or ordinary doses of the medicine indicated, he found that he *aggravated* so much the diseases of his patients, that he rendered their maladies worse instead of better.

"The suitability of a medicine," says Hahnemann, "for any given case of disease does not depend on its accurate homœopathic selection alone, but likewise on the proper size, or rather *smallness* of the dose. If we give *too strong a dose* of a medicine which may have been even quite homœopathically chosen for the morbid state before us, it must, notwithstanding the inherent beneficial character of its nature, prove injurious by its mere magnitude, and by the unnecessary, *excessive* impression it makes upon the vital force which it convulses," &c.—(*Organon*, p. 321.) For, "a medicine," says he, "of a positive and curative kind, will, without any fault in itself, produce just the contrary of that which it ought to do, if given in excessive quantity, by producing a greater disease than that present."—(*Medicine of Experience*, 1805.)

It was in consequence of finding that the medicines, when given in large ordinary doses, were liable to produce a great and danger-

ous aggravation of the disease, that Hahnemann descended from these larger ordinary doses to smaller and smaller quantities. For this reason “a medicine (he elsewhere observes), even though it may be homœopathically suited to the ease of disease, does harm in every dose that is too large, the MORE HARM THE LARGER THE DOSE; and by the magnitude of the dose it does more harm the greater its homœopathicity.”—(*Organon*, p. 321.)

“With them (very large ordinary doses) patients may,” says Dr Black, “be treated homœopathically; but then we may frequently expect a *positive increase of the disease, or even death*. The experience of such painful and dangerous aggravations, in no case necessary to cure, led Hahnemann to employ minute doses.”¹

Latterly Hahnemann’s extended experience led him, as he states, to the conviction, that the “*minutest* doses, to use his own words, are *always* able to overcome the disease.” And specially, he contemptuously denominates those homœopathic physicians “wiseacres,” who affect to disbelieve the perfect and certain medicinal power and potency of decillionth doses, or drugs in the thirtieth dilution.²

In elsewhere insisting upon the necessity of the very smallest doses of the selected remedy, Hahnemann adds,—“The very smallest, I repeat; for it holds good, and will continue to hold good, as a homœopathic therapeutic maxim, *not to be refuted by any experience in the world*, that the best dose of the properly selected remedy is always the VERY SMALLEST one, in one of the high dynamisations (\bar{X} or the thirtieth dilution), as well for chronic as for acute diseases,—a truth that is the inestimable property of pure homœopathy, and which, as long as allopathy, and the new mongrel system, made up of a mixture of allopathic and homœopathic processes, is not much better, continues to gnaw like a cancer at the life of sick human beings, and to ruin them by large and ever larger doses of drugs, will keep pure homœopathy separated from these spurious arts as by an impassable gulf.”—(*Organon*, p. 289.)

What is the actual amount of these “very smallest” doses,—the billionth, quadrillionth, sextillionth, &c., of a single grain? We shall try to answer this question in a future chapter. A preliminary matter must, however, first engage our attention, viz.—the modes of preparation of the doses.

¹ Treatise on Homœopathy, p. 81.

² See Dr Dudgeon’s Edit. of the *Organon*, p. 318.

CHAPTER VI.

MODES OF PREPARATION OF THE INFINITESIMAL DOSES EMPLOYED BY HOMŒOPATHISTS; NUMBER OF TRITURATIONS, SHAKES, ETC., REQUIRED; INFECTION OF GLOBULES BY CONTACT WITH EACH OTHER.

BEFORE we can understand the very minute infinitesimal amount of the doses of the drugs employed by homœopathic physicians, it is necessary to state the way in which they *prepare* these doses. And in order to comprehend their modes of preparation, it is proper to premise, that homœopathists generally use their doses, either, 1st, in the form of solutions or tinctures; or, 2dly, in the form of globules or small pills. These tinctures or globules¹ vary in strength, or in the infinitesimal amount of the drug which they contain. Hence Homœopathists speak of tinctures or globules (of aconite or sulphur, for instance), of the 1st, 2d, 3d, 10th, 20th, 30th, &c., “dilution,” “attenuation,” “potency” or “dynamisation” (for these terms are used synonymously); and they signify by these terms the degree of division to which one drop, or two, of the drug, if it be fluid (as the vegetable juices, &c., are), or one grain of the drug, if it be a solid (as the minerals are), is subjected in the preparation of their infinitesimal doses. But lest any mis-statement occur on this point, let me cite the directions which Hahnemann himself gives on the subject of the division or dilution of drugs in his *Organon*:—

“Two drops of the fresh vegetable juice (of the drug, whatever it may be), mingled with equal parts of alcohol, are diluted with ninety-eight drops of alcohol, and potentised by means of two succussions, whereby the first development of power is formed, and this process is repeated through twenty-nine more phials, each of which is filled three-quarters full with ninety-nine drops of alcohol, and each succeeding phial is to be provided with one drop from the preceding phial (which has already been shaken twice), and is in its

¹ Sometimes, also, homœopathic drugs are exhibited in the form of powders—the infinitesimal doses of the drug being given in a quantity of powder of sugar, or sugar of milk.

turn shaken, and in the same manner at last the thirtieth development of power (potentised decillionth dilution \bar{X}) which is the one most generally used. All other substances," he continues, "adapted for medicinal use (except sulphur, which has of late years been only employed in the form of a highly-diluted (\bar{X} or 30th) tincture),—as pure or oxydised and sulphuretted metals and other minerals, petroleum, phosphorus, as also parts and juices of plants that can only be obtained in the dry state, animal substances, neutral salts, &c.,—all these are first to be potentised by trituration for three hours, up to the millionfold pulverulent attenuation; and of this one grain is to be dissolved, and brought to the thirtieth development of power by means of twenty-seven attenuating phials, in the same manner as the vegetable juices."—*Organon*, p. 315.

When not tinctures, but *Globules* are to be used by the homœopathic physician, they are prepared as follows:—Globules of sugar of milk, or of common sugar, or sugar and starch (for all these different ingredients are used), of the size of poppy seeds, are made and moistened with the proper dilution or attenuation, as the 3d, 6th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 30th, or whatever may be employed. To impregnate the globules with the appropriate dilution, the globules are touched by the moistened stopper of the phial containing the dilution itself, and are themselves subsequently laid aside dry in stoppered phials, and thus kept ready for future use.¹

In his work on Chronic Diseases, Hahnemann gives much more minute directions than in his *Organon*, for the preparation of these homœopathic dilutions and globules. In a series of directions of considerable length, he orders the 30th attenuation of the drug to be effected in a porcelain mortar, by means of *six* triturations of *six* minutes each, and *six* scrapings of *four* minutes each. And he directs all the higher attenuations above the 3d or millionth attenuation powder, to be made by means of solutions in equal parts of alcohol and distilled water. To make, for example, the 4th dilution, one grain of this 3d or millionth attenuation powder, is placed in a phial, and one hundred drops of a mixture of alcohol and distilled water are poured over it. Hahnemann further directs this phial to be stoppered, turned slowly round on its axis for some minutes until the powder is dissolved, and then the phial is to be twice shaken. The next, or 5th dilution, is formed by adding one drop of the pre-

¹ Hahnemann's Work on Chronic Diseases, vol. i.; Dr Forbes' Medical Review, vol. xxi. p. 237.

ceding dilution to ninety-nine drops of pure alcohol and water, and mixing this in the same way with two shakes of the phial. The 6th, and all the subsequent attenuations or dilutions, are procured precisely in the same manner,—one drop of the solution immediately preceding it, being mixed with one hundred drops of alcohol and water, and twice shaken in order to make the next dilution. In reference to the whole body of strangely formal and mysterious directions and manipulations inculcated, and the rules dogmatically laid down by Hahnemann, with regard to the preparation of the infinitesimal doses, it must be owned that the minutiae which he affects to give regarding the proper amount, and length of time of the several and separate triturations, scrapings, and shakings of the powders and phials, are so cabalistic as to be calculated to excite suspicion in every unprejudiced mind. “Altogether (says Dr Forbes), it must be admitted, that the whole complexion of the thing bears a much closer resemblance to what we have heard or seen of magical ceremonies and the tricks of conjurors, demonstrations for effect and to produce an impression, than to any operation of a scientific or *bona fide* character.”¹ Nothing, for example, could well be imagined bearing more of an equivocal character than Hahnemann’s strong directions about “two shakes” only of the attenuation-phials being necessary. He even condescends upon the character of the shakes, and advises them not to be “slovenly,” while in relation to their number he warns his disciples against their exceeding two, lest the resulting drug be made over strong, or, as he termed it, too highly “potentised” or “dynamised” by the succussions. “The homœopathic medicine (says he) becomes *potentised* at every division and diminution by trituration or succussion, a development of the inherent powers of medicinal substances, which was never dreamed of before my time, and which is of so powerful a character, that of late years I have been compelled by convincing experience to reduce the *ten* succussions, formerly directed to be given after each attenuation, to *two*.”—(*Organon*, p. 325.) He averred, that in this way the simple shaking of fluid medicines by the practitioners carrying them about in the pocket, as some homœopaths did, greatly potentised them; and he consequently warned his followers against this source of danger in their practice. (See *Organon*, p. 316.)²

¹ British and Foreign Medical Review, vol. xxi. p. 238.

² “There are, however (says Hahnemann), homœopaths who carry about with them, on their visits to patients, the homœopathic medicines in the fluid state, and yet

“Liquid medicines (he elsewhere observes) do not become, by their greater and greater attenuation, *weaker* in power, but always *more* potent and penetrating. For homœopathic purposes, this dilution is performed by well shaking a drop of the medicine with a hundred drops of a non-medicinal fluid; from the bottle so shaken, a drop is taken, and shaken up in the same manner with another hundred drops of unmedicinal fluid, and so on. This result, so incomprehensible to the man of figures, goes so far that we must set bounds to the succussion process, in order that the degree of attenuation be not over-balanced by the increased potency of the medicine, and in that way the highest attenuations become too active. If we wish, for example, to attenuate a drop of the juice of *Sundew* to the decillionth, but shake each of the bottles with twenty or more succussions from a powerful arm, in the hand of which the bottle is held, in that case this medicine, which I have discovered to be the specific remedy for the frightful epidemic, Hooping-cough of children, will have become so powerful in the fifteenth attenuation (spiritualization), that a drop of it given in a teaspoonful of water, would endanger the life of such a child; whereas, if each dilution-bottle were shaken but *twice* (with two strokes of the arm), and prepared in this manner up to the decillionth attenuation, a sugar globule the size of a poppy-seed, moistened with the last attenuation, cures this terrible disease with this single dose, without endangering the health of the child in the slightest degree.”¹

Hahnemann was thus afraid lest more than two shakes of each dilution of this and other medicines would make them too powerful. Yet Dr Mure prepares each of his homœopathic dilutions, not with two shakes, but with 300; and, besides, he uses, not the human arm, but a machine, for the purpose of making the shakes more perfect and complete;—a plan, I believe, adopted by some homœopathic practitioners also in London. And Jenichen’s celebrated preparations are said to have had 6000 shakes. Such is “infallible” homœopathic experience. “Whilst Hahnemann warned against giving *Drosera* (Sundew) in hooping-cough that had been prepared with 20 shakes, Jenichen’s preparation of that drug in the 500th

who assert that they do *not* become more highly potentised in the course of time; *but* (he adds) *they thereby show their want of ability to observe correctly.*” (*Organon*, p. 316.)

¹ See his Lesser Writings, p. 822.

dilution was shaken 6000 times in the 5000th dilution, or 60,000 times.”¹ But we have no misgiving or doubt, that all the preparations of this and all the other homœopathic drugs, whatever were the number of shakes given to them, whether 2 only, or 300, or 6000, or 60,000, answered equally well; and were equally innocent of good or of evil to those that swallowed them.

Before concluding the present chapter, it is proper to add, that besides preparing the drugs contained in their globules, by triturations, shakings, &c., as described above, some homœopaths have manufactured their infinitesimal globules in another way. The mode to which I allude, consists in making globules by a kind of process of INFECTION. Korsakoff first pointed it out, and averred, that by shaking one duly medicated drug globule with several thousand unmedicated globules, these unmedicated globules became duly drugged by thus being merely in the neighbourhood of the medicated one. And, of course, the globules thus prepared, were averred to be found by “experience” to be duly efficacious and successful in the removal and treatment of disease. In his *Lesser Writings*, Hahnemann offers the following remarks as an explanation of the mode in which pure globules become in this way drugged by infection or contact:—“Thus much (he observes) is deducible from his (Korsakoff’s) experiments, that, since a single dry globule imbibed with a high medicinal dynamisation, communicates to 13,500 unmedicated globules, with which it is shaken for five minutes, *medicinal power fully equal to what it possesses itself*, without suffering any diminution of power itself, it seems that this marvellous communication takes place by means of proximity and contact, and is a sort of INFECTION, bearing a strong resemblance to the infection of healthy persons by a contagion brought near or in contact with them.” (P. 859.)

Surely it would be difficult to carry human assertion and human credulity further than this.

¹ Journal of Homœopathy for 1849, p. 446.

CHAPTER VII.

DYNAMIZATION OR INCREASED POTENCY OF DRUGS BY TRITURATION AND DILUTION; ALLEGED NECESSITY OF EXHIBITING ONLY ONE MEDICINE AT ONE TIME; BUT HOMŒOPATHISTS ACT CONSTANTLY AGAINST THIS LAW.

In a paragraph in the preceding chapter, we have seen that Hahnemann supposes that the infinitesimal dilution of a drug rendered it stronger and stronger in its medicinal properties. And already, in a preceding page (p. 23), we have also found him announcing, that this infinitesimal division produces a real *spiritualisation* (to use his own term) of the medicinal powers of each drug. "The effect," says he, "of a homœopathic dose of medicine increases, the greater the quantity of liquid in which it is dissolved, when administered to the patient, although the actual amount of medicine remains the same." Thus, for example, common table or sea salt (*Natrum Muriaticum*), which we all swallow daily in sufficient quantities with our food, "when carried to the 30th or decillionth dilution, becomes (according to Hahnemann) a powerful and heroical medicament, which can only be administered to patients with the greatest caution." (*Lee's Homœopathy*, p. 5.) Long trituration may thus, if carried very far, make, it is alleged by some, the powers of drugs "*quite ungovernable*." (*Journal of Homœopathy* for 1849, p. 445.) And Hahnemann maintains, that even insoluble substances, as gold, platinum, charcoal, &c. &c., when triturated with sugar, and prepared in the mode above directed, *become* medicinal in infinitesimal doses, though they were in no degree medicinal in larger quantities, and in their original forms. To reason, with the object of refuting such propositions, would be a waste of time and words. That substances having a medicinal power on the animal economy in their common medicinal doses, should, when subdivided down to millions of millions of times their ordinary doses, possess in *each* of these inconceivably infinitesimal doses, a medicinal property *greater* than the dose had

originally possessed before its subdivision at all, would certainly be a thing "most strange and unaccountable." "But (says Dr Forbes) when—going far beyond all this—we find the homœopathist maintaining that substances utterly powerless in a state of sensible bulk, even in the greatest amount, acquire astonishing powers by mere subdivision, without any discoverable change in their physieal or chemical properties,—can any proposition be submitted to human apprehension that seems more utterly improbable, more ludicrously absurd? To be called on to believe that the decillionth of a grain of chareoal or oyster-shell, is capable of producing hundreds of the most formidable symptoms, and of curing, as by magic, the most inveterate diseases—while we can take ounces, nay, pounds, of the very same substance into our stomachs, with no other inconvenience than its mechanical bulk—seems so gratuitous an outrage to human reason, that the mind instinctively recoils from the proposition."¹

The homœopaths, however, it must be allowed, display "some method" in this section of their creed. Hahnemann maintains, as one of his dogmas, that every substance, when properly prepared, has a medicinal action upon the body, and that its action becomes the greater the more minutely it is subdivided and diluted. It would naturally occur to every sensible man, that, in opposition to Hahnemann's dogma, he could prove, from his own experience, this dogma to be untrue in regard to wine and alcohol. To avert, however, the stern argument derivable from this self-evident inconsistency, Hahnemann takes special care to make these two very substances exceptions in his creed to his alleged general rule. "Wine (says he) and alcohol are the only excitants, the heating and intoxicating effects of which are *diminished* by their dilution with water." (*Organon*, p. 329.) When the world is deliberately told this, has it not "a right to impute *design*, or more than design, somewhere?"

Another of Hahnemann's rules, in regard to the exhibition of drugs, and one that is much insisted upon by most homœopathists, is thus laid down by him in his *Organon*, p. 319:—"In no case is it requisite to administer more than *one single simple* medicinal substance at one time." The true physician, he observes, "never thinks of giving as a remedy, any but a *single* simple medicinal substance," for "it is yet impossible to foresee how two and more

¹ British and Foreign Medical Review for 1846, vol. xxi., p. 235.

medicinal substances might, when compounded, obstruct and alter each other's actions on the human body." (P. 320.)

But in few or no instances can the homœopaths, if they follow their own laws, give a single simple substance as a medicine at any one time.¹ Take one drug as an example of this remark. Opium, according to Jahr (one of the greatest homœopathic authorities on *materia medica*), is, in homœopathic practice, "a medicament *frequently* indicated" in disorders of various kinds. Opium, however, is not a simple substance; but, on the other hand, it is extremely composite in its character, according to the researches of many excellent chemists. "It contains," says Dr Christison, "no fewer than seven crystalline principles, called (1) morphia, (2) codeia, (3) paramorphia, (4) narcotin, (5) narceïn, (6) porphyroxin, and (7) meconin, of which the first three are alkaline, and the others neutral; secondly, a peculiar acid termed (8) meconic acid, which constitutes, with sulphuric acid, the solvent of the active principle; and, thirdly, a variety of comparatively unimportant ingredients, such as (9) gum, (10) albumen, (11) resin, (12) fixed oil, (13) a trace perhaps of volatile oil, (14) lignin, (15) caoutchouc, (16) extractive matter, and numerous salts of inorganic bases."² Of these inorganic salts and substances in opium, Schindler, in his analysis, detected among others, (17) phosphate of lime, (18) alumina, (19) silica, (20) magnesia, (21) oxide of iron, &c.³ Homœopaths, in using therefore this "frequently indicated" medicament—opium, employ a preparation, which is certainly not single, but consists, at least, of some twenty different substances. Further, homœopathists themselves know it to be thus a sufficiently composite substance, seeing that sometimes they order to be used, singly and separately, one or other of the twenty or more individual ingredients composing it, as morphia, narcotin, or some of the various salts and inorganic bases which are known to be contained in it.

But again, when the homœopath prescribes and uses what he deems to be a single simple medicine, such as the morphia of which we have spoken, or any other single and separate alkali, salt, or drug, he does not exhibit that single separate medicine alone, but,

¹ "All raw animal and vegetable substances have a greater or less amount of medicinal power, and are capable of altering man's health, each in its own peculiar way."—*Organon*, p. 311. Few, however, or, in fact, none of them, are in reality "single, simple" substances.

² Christison's *Dispensatory*, p. 672.

³ *Pharm. Central Blatt*, 1834, p. 574.

in every instance, breaks the law, learnedly and dogmatically laid down by Hahnemann, when Hahnemann stated that "more than one single simple medicine was never to be exhibited at one time." For, in the very preparation of his drug, he necessarily mixes up with it, when he triturates, scrapes, shakes it, &c., one or more additional ingredients; and some of these are, according to the creed of the homœopathists, very powerful medicaments, and further increased in their potency by the very infinitesimal smallness in which they are prepared and commingled with the drug employed. Flakes of carbon, &c., are, for instance, contained in almost every portion of water, however carefully distilled, and they are constantly floating in every room and laboratory, and must thus almost inevitably be commixed and "potentised" in the trituration and solution of every homœopathic drug. Every mortar used in their long and laborious triturations, of necessity yields some of *its* particles under the frictions to which it is subjected. Silex, the principal component of most mortars, is thus also, by a physical necessity, mixed up with the preparing medicine; but is itself, at the same time, a medicine which, in its infinitesimal billionths and decillionths, is capable, according to the homœopathic materia medica, of creating many hundred more or less formidable symptoms.¹ In most

¹ According to Jahr's Homœopathic Materia Medica, SILEX or FLINT is usually employed in the 30th dilution; and the duration of its effects or symptoms is from seven to eight weeks. Doses of silex or flint produce, according to Jahr (the principal homœopathic authority on such subjects), 372 different symptoms. Of these symptoms, he classes 23 under general symptoms; 17 symptoms under the functions and states of the skin; 14 under sleep; 6 under fever symptoms; 17 under moral symptoms; 28 under head symptoms; 23 under eye symptoms; 15 under ear symptoms; 17 under nose symptoms; 19 under face symptoms; 7 under teeth symptoms; 8 under mouth symptoms; 5 under throat symptoms; 18 under appetite symptoms; 14 under stomach symptoms; 17 under abdominal symptoms; 7 under fœces symptoms; 5 under urine symptoms; 9 under symptoms of genital organs; 14 under catamenia symptoms; 11 under larynx symptoms; 9 under chest symptoms; 13 under trunk symptoms; 20 under arm symptoms; and 36 under leg symptoms. To give some idea of the strange collection of alleged phenomena, symptoms believed by homœopathists to be produced in these different parts, organs, or functions, by silex and by other medicines, let us select one of these divisions as an example of the whole. The following are the twenty "MORAL SYMPTOMS" alleged to be produced by doses of FLINT or SILEX, viz:—

"Melancholy and disposition to weep; nostalgia; anxiety and agitation; taciturnity—concentration in self; inquietude and ill-humour on the least provocation, arising from excessive nervous debility; *scruples of conscience*; great liability to be frightened, especially by noise; discouragement; moroseness, ill-humour, and despair, with intense weariness of life; disposition to fly into a rage, obstinacy, and great irritability;

mortars (even those of agate) alum, &c., are generally also present, and become mixed, and by trituration “potentised,” with the drug in preparation. These sources must—at least if Hahnemann’s own ideas be true—pervert or cancel, to a greater or less degree, the therapeutic effects of every homœopathic drug and globule used in billionths, decillionths, &c., prepared and potentised by long triturations; and must consequently give a therapeutic result different from the result obtained by the mere “provings” (as they are termed) of the true and simple drug itself, by their exhibition to persons in a state of health; these “provings” having been generally made on large allopathic doses of the same, not commixed with “potentised” doses of silex, alum, &c. The commixture in question, also, of course, directly and flatly interferes in all cases with Hahnemann’s great dogma, never to “administer more than one single simple medicine at one time.” To use his own expression, “a compound could never make a *simple*,—in all eternity, never.”¹

Yet, if Hahnemann followed his own rules of trituration, he never perhaps used a globule that was not thus a compound.

repugnance to labour; apathy and indifference; weakness of memory; incapacity for reflection; great distraction; tendency to misapply words in speaking; fixed ideas, the patient THINKS ONLY OF PINS, fears them, searches for them, and counts them carefully.”—*Jahr’s Manual of Homœopathic Medicine*, vol. i. p. 532.

Hahnemann considerably warns his disciples not to use flint or silex in too large doses. “In fact (says he) dilutions of SILEX to the billionth or trillionth degree, produce effects much too violent; that of the sextillionth degree may be commenced with, but this only suits *robust* persons; in irritable subjects it is prudent to use only the decillionth dilution.”—*Lee’s Homœopathy*, p. 5.

¹ Lesser Writings, p. 834.

CHAPTER VIII.

CALCULATIONS RELATIVE TO THE ACTUAL AMOUNT OF THE INFINITESIMAL DOSES,—DECILLIONTHS, BILLIONTHS, ETC.; VARIATIONS OF DILUTIONS FROM 1 TO 2000THS; BUT EFFECTS QUITE THE SAME FROM ALL THE DILUTIONS.

AT the conclusion of the fifth chapter (p. 39), we have quoted a passage from the last edition of the *Organon*, published by Hahnemann in 1833, and containing the evidence of his own matured experience in homœopathy, relative to the most appropriate doses of drugs that should be employed in the treatment, both of chronic and acute diseases. “It holds good,” says he, “and will continue to hold good as a homœopathic therapeutic maxim, NOT TO BE REFUTED BY ANY EXPERIENCE IN THE WORLD, that the best dose of the properly selected remedy is always the very smallest one in one of the high dynamisations (\bar{X} or the thirtieth dilution), as well for chronic as for acute diseases.”¹—(*Organon*, p. 289.)

The thirtieth dilution, which Hahnemann here declares as infallibly the most appropriate dose, “*as well for chronic as for acute diseases*,” consists of a decillionth of a grain, or a decillionth of a drop of the drug, whatever drug that may be which is employed. If we express this quantity arithmetically, it amounts to

1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 of a grain or drop. The human intellect, however, can scarcely appreciate the smallness of this quantity when expressed either in language or in figures. And to obtain some slight idea of the infinitesimal exiguity of dose which is thus contained in the thirtieth dilution,—the “best dose,” according to Hahnemann, “*as well for chronic as for acute diseases*,”—let us take one or two illustrations to help the mind to some distant conception of the medicinal dose thus recommended to be used by him, and which he has declared, as an infallible “therapeutic maxim,” to be always the most appropriate dose.

¹ “The only exception to this is the administration of Camphor-spirit in Cholera.” (*Journal of Homœopathy for 1849*, p. 452.)

I have already stated (p. 13), that the earth is computed to contain, at the present time, some 900,000,000 human beings; and that if all these 900,000,000 had been called into existence when Adam was created,—some 6000 years ago,—and had lived up to the present time, and each of these 900,000,000 individuals had, when first called into existence, begun to swallow, and continued to swallow up to the present hour, without rest or cessation, night and day, a decillionth dose of a grain (say a grain of sulphur or quinine, or other drug), such as Hahnemann recommends to be used, these 900,000,000 beings would not yet, during these past 6000 years, have finished one single grain of the medicine. Nay,—if each of these 900,000,000 men, now 6000 years old, had swallowed, during *every* moment of their past existence, not a single globule, but *one million* of globules of Hahnemann's 30th dilution, they would not yet have finished a single grain, and would not finish it, working constantly every second at the same rate, for millions of centuries yet to come.

Yet Hahnemann and his followers calmly tell us, that—take two or three of these single decillionth doses of a single grain of their drugs, and with these infinitesimal doses of the requisite medicine you may cure any acute or chronic curable disease to which mankind is liable. And that one of these decillionths is truly the proper dose of the medicine to be used, is “a therapeutic maxim (says Hahnemann) not to be refuted by any experience in the world.”

To understand, if possible, the exiguity of “the best” dose of a homœopathic drug as thus laid down by Hahnemann, let us turn to another means of stating the infinitesimal amount of the dose. For this purpose let us suppose, merely for the sake of illustration, that the drug employed was commixed with a mass of sea-sand, as its vehicle or medium, instead of a mass of sugar or starch, such as is employed in forming homœopathic globules and powders.

Most rational men, whether acquainted with medicine or not, would surely and justly look with perfect incredulity upon any physician who should maintain that *one* single grain of sulphur (to take it as an example) properly commixed with a heap of sand made by reducing to powder the stones, &c., employed in building and rearing all the houses in Edinburgh, or in London, or in Great Britain, would impart to each of the particles of the heap a sufficient amount of sulphur to enable it, if swallowed, to be a proper and sufficient dose for curing a man of Itch. Or if some enthusiast were to spring up and aver that a single grain of phosphorous or of aconite, so infinitely

BIBLIOT.
COLL. REG.
MED. EDIN

divided, that an equal portion of one grain of these drugs distributed among *all* the particles of sand that lie on all the sea-shores of Great Britain, from Caithness to Cornwall, could change and medicate each one of these grains of sand, so that any dozen or two of them picked up along the coast of England or Scotland would, if swallowed, be certain to influence and cure a case of inflammation of the lungs or of inflammatory fever, if given to men affected with these diseases, would the world not deem the assertor of this fact to be stating something beyond the bounds of mere extravagance and eccentricity? And, if our supposed enthusiast were further coolly and deliberately to aver, that his single grain of phosphorous or aconite, if divided amongst all the grains of sand to be found along all the sea-shores of our world, would equally, if not more certainly, cure the same inflammation or fever, would he not be looked upon as a man outraging every principle of possible belief? But the homœopaths aver infinitely more than this. Hahnemann and his followers, in using the 30th dilution of aconite, phosphorous, &c., aver that a *single grain* of any of them, distributed equally through a mass of sand as large as the bulk of the whole Earth itself, or indeed through a mass of sand even millions of millions of times greater than the Earth, would bestow the same healing property upon one and all of the particles of sand forming these immense masses, and that any ten or twenty of these medicated particles would form "the best" dose of the drug for the supposed ease of pneumonia or fever.

It has been computed that a cubic inch of sea-sand contains a million of particles of sand. The globe of our Earth is reckoned by physical geographers to contain about four thousand millions of cubic feet, or nearly seven quadrillion cubic inches. If the whole mass of the Earth from its surface to its centre were bruised down and converted into sea-sand, and a single grain of any homœopathic drug as a grain of sulphur, or aconite, or phosphorus, was so commixed with the sand that each particle of sand had a proper relative share or allotment of this single grain, each of these particles would contain *more* sulphur, or aconite, or phosphorus, than the homœopaths use when they use the decillionth of a grain of sulphur, or phosphorus, or aconite, or any other of their drugs in the 30th dilution. It would require, in fact, a mass of sea-sand millions of times greater than the whole mass of the Earth to reduce each particle of sand to a homœopathic decillionth. Or, to state it otherwise, a decillion of particles of sea-sand would make a million of worlds

or globes as large as the Earth. The diameter of the Earth is nearly 8000 miles: the diameter of the orbit of Neptune is nearly 6000 millions of miles; a vast difference. But even a world or sphere of sea-sand, with a diameter equal to that of the orbit of Neptune, would not have its particles reduced to a decillionth. In other words, each of the single particles in this vast mass would be larger than a decillionth of the whole; and the proper dose of a single grain of a drug divided equally among these decillionths would be one particle picked out of this inconceivable mass of sand.

In order to impart to the human mind some faint, very faint, idea of the enormous distances of the stars, writers on astronomy have had recourse to a variety of illustrations. It has been computed that a cannon-ball, impelled with the greatest velocity which art can produce, would travel at the rate of 600 miles an hour; and flying at this rate, would require twenty years to pass from the earth to the sun, and about five millions of years ere it could reach the nearest fixed star. But the velocity of light is immensely greater. According to Struve's late investigations, it flies at the rate of 166,000 geographical miles, or nearly 200,000 English miles, in a second. Travelling at this enormous rate, a ray of light passes from the Moon to the Earth in $1\frac{1}{4}$ second; from the Sun to the Earth in 8 minutes; but would require about three years to travel from the fixed star *α Centauri* to the Earth. Other stars however are vastly more distant. The elder Herschel calculated that light, travelling at the enormous velocity we have stated, would require almost two millions of years to pass to the earth from the remotest luminous vapour reached by his forty feet reflecting telescope. And Professor Nichol imagines, from later observations with stronger instruments, that possibly there may be stars "situated so deep in space that the rays of light from them do not reach our earth until after travelling across intervening abysses during centuries whose number stuns the imagination." Possibly there may be some, he imagines, from which light would require to travel THIRTY MILLIONS OF YEARS, in order to reach our planet.

Truly, such astronomical calculations do, as Professor Nichol observes, "stun the imagination" of man. They are as nought, however, in comparison with the ideas and computations of homœopathists. For one single grain of any homœopathic medicine, as sulphur, quinine, silex, &c. &c. &c., divided into decillionth globules of the 30th dilution, and arranged as twenty globules to the inch,

would form a continuous line or string of globules reaching far, far beyond this inconceivable profundity in space. In other words, this grain of sulphur, &c. &c. &c., would, when divided into a decillion of homœopathic globules, make a line over which light, travelling at the rate of 200,000 miles in a second, would require above 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 years to pass along. Yet, aver Hahnemann and his followers, any one of these decillion globules of a single grain of the proper drug, picked out of this inconceivable length of line, would be found duly medicated for the treatment of all diseases, acute and chronic, and would form the most appropriate dose for their treatment. Truly the human imagination sometimes rapidly passes from the sublime to the ridiculous.

A row of homœopathic globules, extended enough to form a string 25,000 miles long, and which consequently could encircle the earth, would be passed over by a ray of light in the eighth part of a second, or “in the twinkling of an eye.” But it would require a ray of light to travel millions of millions of millions of millions of years, before it could pass from one end to another of one single grain of sulphur, or of any other homœopathic drug, laid out in homœopathic decillionth globules,—such as Hahnemann used and declared to be, both in acute and chronic diseases, the proper medical dose, “not to be refuted by any experience in the world.” A continuous row of globules from Edinburgh to London—or, in other words, a row of them as long as an express railway train would take twelve hours to pass over, might, at first thought, appear extravagantly long, particularly when it was alleged that all of these numerous globules could have subdivided among them a single grain of a drug, so as to impart to *every* globule in the line the medicinal action of that drug. But how comparatively short is a 400 mile line of globules, to a line of them so extended, that light, travelling at the rate of 6,000,000,000,000 miles a-year, would take above 1000 sextillions of centuries to fly along it? And yet, as Hahnemann asserts, *one single grain* of a medicine distributed equally along this enormous line of globules, would invest *each* of the constituent globules with a power of curing diseases; and forms, in fact, *the best and appropriate dose* of each common drug.

Some homœopaths, however, use their drugs not in GLOBULES or particles, such as the preceding illustrations refer to, but in TINCTURES or Solutions. Let us consider for a moment the tenuity of these homœopathic solutions or tinctures.

Soon after the promulgation of Hahnemann's doctrines, it was suggested that, "If the decillionth part of a grain have any efficacy, an ounce of medicine (Epsom salts) thrown into the Lake of Geneva would be sufficient to physic all the Calvinists of Switzerland."

But more careful systematic calculations have shown, that this is stopping infinitely short of the truth; and that the 30th homœopathic dilution, recommended as we have seen by Hahnemann in all cases, is, in such a parallel, enormously understated, instead of overstated. In fact, the 10th solution alone would, as Mr Cap has shown, require for its proper solution a body of water 500 times greater than the bulk of the Lake of Geneva; or a sea somewhat larger than the Gulf of Venice. To make the 11th solution, a quantity of water greater than the Mediterranean Sea or the German Ocean would be necessary. The 12th solution could scarcely be accomplished in a sea extending over the whole surface of the earth, and 500 fathoms in depth. And if the whole Solar System were buried in an ocean extending in depth from the sun to Neptune, it would not form a sufficient fluid medium for adequately dissolving to the 30th dilution a common dose of any of the common medicines of the homœopathists. Yet the homœopathists allege, a few drops or sips of the proper medicine, properly dissolved in such enormous medicated seas and oceans, infallibly acts and cures; and that each drop would be found of "terrific potency," if the drug were duly mixed.

The preceding calculations are based upon the supposition that the 30th dilution of the drug is the dilution employed,—as was recommended by Hahnemann in his last publication, and as is followed by his more earnest successors. But in regard to the amount of the dose of the drug given, it is proper to add, that two new schools of homœopathists have arisen. One of these schools maintains, that it is better to administer the drugs in larger doses, or the lower dilutions, as they are termed, than the 30th; while the opposite school avers, that in their experience they have gained every possible success by using the medicines in higher dilutions or attenuations than even the 30th of Hahnemann. As supporting the latter view, the *British Journal of Homœopathy* enumerates Gross, Stapf, Bönninghausen, Reiss, Tietze, Hering, Blöda, Nehrer, Nunez, Crosiero, &c.; and as supporting the former, Käsemann, Watzke, Cl. and J. O. Müller, Hartmann, Genzke, Wolf, Trinks, Johannsen, Griesselich, Arnaud, Molin, and Roth.¹

¹ *Journal of Homœopathy* for 1849, p. 460.

Those who use the lower dilutions, generally use them from the 3d attenuation, or millionth part of a grain or drop, to the 6th, or billionth part of the same. With various homœopathic practitioners who adhere to the larger doses, or lower dilutions, the 6th dilution or billionth of a grain seems to be the general and favourite dose. But in order to finish one single grain only, of sulphur or of any other homœopathic drug, divided into billionths, a man would require to swallow constantly, night and day, for above 30,000 years, a dose or globule every second, 60 globules every minute, 3600 every hour, and 31,536,000 every year during the whole 30,000 years that his sisyphæan task would endure.

On the other hand, those homœopathists who use the higher dilutions have gone up from the 30th to the 100th, 300th, 1000th, 2000th, or even higher.¹

In the last edition of his *Organon*, while Hahnemann recommends the universal employment of the 30th dilution, on the ground of having uniformity of effect and observation, yet he speaks also of the 60th, 150th, or 300th dilutions as efficacious, but he does not recommend them. These observations were published, as I have already stated, in the last edition of the *Organon* in 1833. Subsequently to that period, he issued, says Dr Mure, no new publication, and hence it is believed that the genius of the master remained stationary. This is an error; for Hahnemann afterwards employed dilutions still more refined, and recommended them to his pupils. In a correspondence with Dr Mauro, of later date than 1833, Hahnemann insisted more and more on greater and greater attenuations. In this correspondence, leaving the 30th dilution, he speaks only of the 50th, 60th, and 80th dilutions.²

In 1831 Korsakoff published an account of a 1500th dilution of sulphur, and proclaimed from experience its therapeutic efficacy. In a postscript to Korsakoff's paper, Hahnemann himself spoke of the probability of the efficacy of such dilutions, averring, that the "development of the powers of medicinal substances by the peculiar

¹ The advocates of these high dilutions are "men whom we have been accustomed to reverence, whose names occur in almost every page of Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*, the most zealous coadjutors and esteemed friends of our illustrious master." (*Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. v., p. 154.) In the same *Journal* for October 1850, it is stated by one of the Editors, as the result of a recent journey through Germany,— "As regards the much-vexed question of the dose, we found a *large number* of Practitioners staunch adherents of the high potencies." (P. 554.)

² *Doctrine de l'Ecole de Rio, &c.*, p. 78-9.

homœopathic processes, may be considered almost illimitable." Thirteen years after Korsakoff's paper appeared, Dr Gross, a celebrated German homœopathist, wrote in favour of these high dilutions or potencies. "Your model cures," exclaimed he to his brother homœopathists, "are as *nothing at all*, as compared with the results gained by the high potencies." The dilutions which he used in his practice varied, as he considered them, from the 200th to the 1500th. Gross, Stapf, Bönninghausen, and others, published a series of cases cured by these high potencies, thus appealing in evidence of their truth to what homœopathists aver as the only test of truth,—experience. In an editorial article in the *British Journal of Homœopathy* for 1847, it is stated, "There is, however, in the history of the high dilutions one point which ought to weigh much with us, that is, the testimony to their superiority of so many of the most eminent among the homœopathic physicians of all countries; for, if we consider the adherence of so many sound-headed and talented men to homœopathy a proof in favour of its truth, in like manner we must admit that the adoption of the high dilutions by men who have hitherto occupied the foremost place among Hahnemann's disciples, is powerful evidence in favour of their value."—(P. 132.) In the *Journal de la Médecine Homœopathique* for 1846, Dr Nunez, of Madrid, threw out the following propositions, and detailed several cases in confirmation of them:—"1. That in certain exceptional cases, we may use dilutions below the 2000th. 2. That the most suitable dilutions for acute diseases are those above 2000. 3. That in most chronic complaints it is preferable to employ still higher dilutions. 4. In chronic diseases with organic lesions, the 2000th dilution almost always produces aggravation; in these, therefore, we should ascend much higher than the 2000th." In a paper read before a meeting of homœopaths at Paris in September last, Dr Nunez detailed, among other cases, one of consumption *cured* by the 6000th dilution of sulphur; and instances of diseases removed, or supposed to be removed, by equally high dilutions of arsenic and mercury.¹ The high dilutions were generally made by Herr Jenichen, who refused to tell his mode of preparation. And it has been anxiously doubted

¹ *Journal of Homœopathy* for 1851, p. 692. Jenichen and his abettors alleged, that the powerful friction the medicines received from his mode of preparing them potentized them so much as to "make their powers quite ungovernable!" See *Ibid.* for 1849, p. 445.

and denied by some homœopathists, who favour the low dilutions,¹ whether these drugs were of the very high attenuation that Jenichen stated. But Dr Rummel, the editor of a German Homœopathic Journal, had similar high dilutions prepared by an honest and well-known apothecary in Dessau, and has publicly averred the efficacy and success derived from their employment. In the *Homœopathic Times* for November last, it was stated that M. Perry of Paris had obtained "striking results," in experimenting for years with the high dilutions of Jenichen, and with others prepared by himself from the lower ones of Jenichen.² Mr Headland, of London, has, says the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, "prepared a complete set of these dilutions; and those who know the care and accuracy with which he prepares his medicines in general, will feel assured that high dilutions are what they profess to be." A few months subsequently, it was mentioned in the pages of the same Journal that Mr Newman and Dr Chepmell stated to the British Homœopathic Society the result of their trials with the high potencies. Dr Chepmell had cured cases with the 200th and 800th dilutions, that had resisted the 12th and 30th of the same remedy. And Mr Newman was of opinion, "that if the remedy were homœopathically selected, it would cure in whatever dilution it was administered. He was in the habit of prescribing all dilutions, from the 1st to the 8000th."³

We have endeavoured above to give some idea of the infinite exigency of doses of drugs, when used in the 30th dilution as recommended by Hahnemann. We know of no kind of simile that could possibly give the human mind any adequate idea of the division

¹ As the writer of an Editorial biographical notice of Jenichen in the *Journal of Homœopathy* for January 1852, p. 168. But those homœopathists who, like this writer, are of the "low dilution school," and who are hence so anxious and earnest to account for the "success" of Jenichen's high dilutions by maintaining that they were, perhaps, after all, not very high dilutions of the drugs, forget one important matter in the question. Some years ago, one of the most distinguished writers and practitioners on their own side of the question—namely, Watzke—showed, that when Jenichen's preparations were used and properly watched, they produced *no* effect whatever, *because* (as he argued) they were so very high and very infinitesimal in the dose which they contained. (*Austrian Journal of Homœopathy*, Vol. II., Pt. III., p. 508.) With such evidence, it is impossible, I fear, for the homœopathists to shift from one horn of this unfortunate dilemma to the other, without quietly abandoning and setting aside all their own chosen ground of evidence, viz., "the infallibility of the evidence of experience."

² *Homœopathic Times* for November 8, 1851.

³ *British Journal of Homœopathy* for 1847, p. 532.

which medicines must undergo when reduced to the 100th, 500th, 1000th, or 6000th dilution. An ocean, stretching from the Earth to the farthest known fixed star, or, indeed, as large and extensive as the known astronomical universe, would be inadequate as a medium for the solution of any of the common doses of our common remedies to such a state of attenuation. Yet, to quote again the words of Dr Gross,—“Your model cures are as nothing at all compared with the results gained by these high potencies.” And the evidence in favour of these cures, with these high dilutions or potencies, is certainly as equally strong, or as equally weak, as the evidence in favour of similar cures with the 30th, or lower dilutions used by other homœopathists.

Perhaps, however, in no point in relation to their doctrine of infinitesimal doses, do the homœopathists show more true weakness, and less pre-calculation, than in admitting similar therapeutic properties, and similar medical success and experience from the same drugs, when used in different dilutions. According to their printed records of cases and observations, cures by the same drug are effected, and, if we may believe these records, with *equal* speed and success, by some practitioners when using it in the 1st or 3d dilution; by others when using it in the 30th dilution; and by others, again, when using it in the 100th, or 1000th, or 6000th dilution. In admitting, however, a similar effect to the 3d and 30th dilutions, not to go higher, of the same medicine, the whole question of the power of infinitesimal doses is, in one sense, abandoned. For (not to drive the comparison to the 100th or 1000th dilution) if this 30th dilution, or the one decillionth, succeeds as well as the 3d dilution, or one millionth of a grain of the drug, it is very plain, that neither can have any effect at all. For “what,” observes Dr Wood, “does such an assertion amount to? An absurdity so gross that language *fails* to express it. It is to assert, that if a medicinal substance be divided, not into nine million separate atoms, but into atoms nine million separate times; that is to say, that if the substance be divided into a million of parts, and one of these parts divided into a million again, and one of the last million divided into a million again, and so on till the process of division by a million has been repeated nine times, that one of the atoms, resulting from the last division, will cure disease as readily as the original atom before the division was practised at all. To give a faint idea of the monstrous

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE EXHIBITION OF INFINITESIMAL DOSES OF DRUGS BY SMELLING OR OLFACTION; PREFERENCE OF HAHNEMANN IN LATER LIFE FOR THIS METHOD.

HAHNEMANN, then, as we have seen in the last chapter, maintained, that in the treatment of both acute and chronic diseases, the best and most select dose of every homœopathic drug consisted of a decillionth of a grain of the drug. In other words, he held that, as a general rule, the appropriate division and dose of each medicine used in homœopathic practice (as sulphur, aconite, belladonna, chalk, salt, opium, quinine, gold, &c. &c. &c.) was as follows:—

ONE SINGLE GRAIN of the required drug should be mixed up with a due amount of sugar and starch, and then subdivided into globules, so numerous, that if laid side by side in a continuous row, they would form a line so long, that light, travelling at the rate of 6,000,000,000,000 miles a-year, would require millions, and millions, and millions, and millions of centuries to pass from one end of this line to the other. Further, though this infinite line of globules contained in all only one single grain of the drug, still the best and most appropriate dose of that drug was to be obtained by swallowing one or two globules only, picked out of this extended row of them.

Or, if a tincture and solution, and not a globule, was desired, then ONE SINGLE GRAIN of the required drug should be dissolved in an ocean of water or of spirit, many millions of millions of millions of millions of times broader and deeper than *all* the collected oceans of the Earth;¹ and (according to Hahnemann) one drop or two of fluid from this vast medicated ocean, thus holding in solution one single grain of the drug, would form the best and most appropriate dose of that drug.

Most men would have supposed that Hahnemann had severely enough taxed the credulity of his followers, when he thus advised them to give their patients in all cases and diseases, both acute and

¹ The waters of the collected oceans of the Earth are computed to cover an area of about 147,800,000 square miles; and supposing their mean depth to be two miles, their cubic contents would be nearly 300,000,000 cubic miles. But an ocean many, many, many millions of times larger, would, as stated in the text, be required to dissolve one single grain down to the 30th dilution.

chronic, the drugs which they used in these very infinitesimal doses. To propose to cure all diseases by *a single grain* of the required drug divided among such an infinity of globules, or dissolved in such an enormous ocean, was, one might, *à priori* suppose, carrying human credulity as far as it would go. In the later periods, however, of his life, and as his "experience" accumulated upon him more and more, Hahnemann used his infinitesimal decillionths in a still more infinitesimal manner than that. For latterly he came to recommend his decillionth globules to be *smelled* merely, and not *swallowed* by his patients; and he averred that this smelling or OLFACTION of them was all that was requisite to produce the desired cure.

Writing in 1833, Hahnemann observes,—“all that homœopathy is at all capable of curing (and what can it not cure beyond the domain of mere manual surgical affections?) among excessively *chronic* diseases that have not been quite ruined by allopathy, as also among *acute* diseases, will be most safely and certainly cured by this mode of Olfaction. I can scarcely, he adds, name one in a hundred out of the many patients who have sought the advice of myself and assistant during the past year, whose chronic or acute disease we have not treated with the most happy results, *solely by means of this Olfaction*. During the latter half of this year, moreover, I have become convinced of what I never could previously have believed, that by this mode of Olfaction, the power of the medicine is exercised upon the patient in at least the same degree of strength, and that more quietly, and yet just as long, as when the dose of medicine is taken by the mouth; and that, consequently, the intervals at which the Olfaction should be repeated, should not be shorter than in the injection of the material dose by the mouth.”—(*Organon*, p. 332.)

Dr Gross, using, as we have seen, medicines of the highest potency, “often contented himself with allowing the patients to *smell* the remedy—whether with one or more globules at one time I am not aware—waiting patiently for *four weeks* or so, for the completion of the cure, not even permitting a second smell or dose, so mild yet certain is the remedial action.”¹

Hahnemann appears to have employed the exhibition of his infinitesimal drugs by smelling in two different ways, viz. ;—*First*,

¹ Dr Forbes' Review, vol. xxii. p. 568. For opinions of Ægidi, Perry, and other homœopathic physicians, in regard to exhibiting medicines by olfaction, see British Journal of Homœopathy for 1849, p. 472.

By sometimes making the patients smell a *dried* decillionth globule :—or, *Secondly*, By dissolving a globule or two in water and spirits, and making the patient hold his nose over the surface of this solution of it.

In relation to the smelling of dried globules Hahnemann observes, “A globule, of which ten, twenty, or a hundred weigh a grain, impregnated with the 30th potentised dilution, and then *dried*, retains for this purpose (of olfaction) all its power undiminished for at least 18 or 20 years (my experience extends this length of time), even though the phial be opened a thousand times during that period, if it be but protected from heat and the sun’s light. But (he continues), should both nostrils be stopped up by coryza or polypus, the patient should inhale by the mouth, holding the orifice of the phial betwixt his lips. In little children, it may be applied close to their nostrils whilst they are asleep, with the *certainty* of producing an effect. The medicinal aura thus inhaled, comes in contact with the nerves seated in the walls of the spacious cavities it traverses, without obstruction, and thus produces a salutary influence on the vital force in the mildest, yet most powerful manner. And this, he adds, is *much preferable* to any other mode of administering the medicament in substance by the mouth.”—(*Organon*, p. 332.)

In a note of Hahnemann’s, translated by Dr Dudgeon in his “Lesser Writings,” the founder of homœopathy, states—“A globule of this kind—for example, of staphisagræ, of the 30th dilution—which, in the course of twenty years, had been smelt several hundreds of times after opening the bottle in which it was, for a certain symptom that always recurred of the same character, possesses at this hour equal power as at first, which could not be the case did it not continue exhaling its medicinal power in an inexhaustible manner.” Hahnemann further states—“It is especially in the form of vapour, by smelling and inhaling the medicinal aura, that is always emanating from a globule, impregnated with a medicinal fluid in a high development of power, and placed, *dry*, in a small phial, that the homœopathic remedies act most surely and most powerfully. The homœopathic physician allows the patient to hold the open mouth of the phial first in one nostril, and in the act of inspiration, inhale the air out of it, and then, if it is wished to give a stronger dose, smell in the same manner with the other nostril more or less strongly, according to the strength it is intended the dose should be.”—(*Organon*, p. 331.)

Dr Crosiero of Paris, in a communication published subsequently to Hahnemann's death, gives some more particulars respecting the practice of Hahnemann in the last years of his life, of which he assures us he was often a witness. "Hahnemann," he writes, "always made use of the well-known small globules, which were generally impregnated with the 30th dilution, both for acute and chronic diseases. . . . He latterly employed olfaction very frequently. For this end, he put one or two globules in a small medicine phial, containing two drachms of alcohol, mixed with an equal quantity of water, which he caused to be inhaled once or twice with each nostril,—never oftener. My own wife (says Dr Crosiero) was cured by him in this manner, of a violent pleurisy in the course of five hours. In chronic diseases, happen what might, he never allowed this olfaction to be repeated oftener than once a week. And he gave besides, for internal use, nothing but plain milk-sugar. And in this manner he effected the most marvellous cures, even in cases in which the rest of us had been able to do nothing."¹

According to Hahnemann, even the olfaction or smelling of substances which have no smell may produce immediately direct and decided therapeutic effects. "If," says he, "a grain of gold leaf be triturated strongly for an hour in a porcelain mortar with one hundred grains of sugar of milk, the powder that results (the first trituration) possesses a considerable amount of medicinal power. If a grain of this powder be triturated as strongly and as long with another hundred grains of sugar of milk, the preparation attains a much greater medicinal power, and if this process be continued, and a grain of the previous trituration be rubbed up as strongly and for as long a time, each time with a fresh hundred grains of sugar of milk, until, after fifteen such triturations, the quintillionth attenuation of the original grain of gold leaf is obtained,² then the last attenuations do not display a weaker, but, on the contrary, the most penetrating, the greatest medicinal power of the whole of the attenuations. A single grain of the last (quintillionth) attenuation put into a small clean phial, will restore a morbidly desponding individual, with a constant inclination to commit suicide, in less than an hour to a peaceful state

¹ Cited by Dr Dudgeon in his translation of the *Organon*, p. 302.

² In the above extract Hahnemann recommends the smelling of the quintillionth of a grain of gold. This recommendation was published in 1825. But Dr Dudgeon adds in his book on *Chronic Diseases*, published in 1845, "He of course advises the decillionth or 30th dilution to be given in every case."

of mind, to love of life, to happiness, and horror of his contemplated act, if he perform but a *single Olfaction* in the phial, or put on his tongue a quantity of this powder no bigger than a grain of sand.”—(*Lesser Writings*, p. 821).¹

But what in reality is the quintillionth trituration of a grain of Gold—a single olfaction of which, Hahnemann, in the preceding paragraph, declares to be capable of restoring a morbidly desponding individual to a peaceful state of mind, etc.? To reduce a single grain of Gold, in accordance with Hahnemann’s own rules, to the quintillionth trituration, a mass of sugar, not only higher and broader than the entire range of the Alps, or of the Andes, or of the Himalayas, but as large, at least, as FIFTY globes or worlds the size of the entire Earth, would be required.² Yet Hahnemann avers that one single grain of Gold, distributed duly and equally through such an inconceivable mass, or series of masses, of sugar, would invest every single grain of these masses, taken and put into a small clean phial, with a power of restoring “a morbidly desponding individual, with a constant inclination to commit suicide, in less than an hour, to a peaceful state of mind, to love of life, to happiness, and horror of his contemplated act, if he perform but a *single olfaction* in the phial.”

It is easy to estimate the medical value or valuelessness of such a dose, given either in the way of Olfaction or otherwise. It may be more difficult to estimate the *pecuniary* value of such a prescription. But perhaps most sane minds will hold, that a due appreciation of the billion-worth of such a homœopathic dose by Olfaction, was formed by a patient mentioned by the Editor of the *Pharmaceutical Journal*. “We have heard (says he) of a lady who, having been subjected to this process (the administration of a homœopathic dose by Olfaction) by her homœopathic doctor, passed the fee before *his* nose, and then—replaced it in her pocket.”³

¹ In his *Organon*, p. 9, he states, in the same complacent tone, that if a dyspeptic, with eructations, depression, cold feet, etc., smell only once a globule of pulsatilla of a high dilution (the 30th?) “the derangement of his health in general, and of his stomach in particular, will certainly be removed, in two hours he is *quite well*!”

² See Appendix.

³ *Pharmaceutical Journal* for January 1851, p. 318.

CHAPTER X.

PROVINGS, OR MEANS OF DETERMINING THE SYMPTOMS
WHICH SPECIAL DRUGS CAN CAUSE, AND HENCE CAN CURE;
INSTANCES OF HOUSE-SALT, CARBONATE OF LIME, ETC.

THE principles which ought to guide the homœopathists in the selection of the proper drug for any case under treatment, and the mode or modes of determining, with this view, the special virtues of the different drugs employed by them, are repeatedly stated and inculcated by Hahnemann. He lays it down as one of his "indubitable truths," that "the *sum* of all the SYMPTOMS in each individual case of disease must be the *sole* indication, the *sole* guide to direct us in the choice of a curative remedy."¹ "By the removal (he maintains) of the whole of the perceptible *Signs* and *Symptoms* of the disease, the *sum* total of the disease is at the same time removed."² And he elsewhere observes, "It must (regard being had to the possibility of a miasm, and attention paid to the accessory circumstances), be the *Symptoms* ALONE, by which the disease demands and points to the remedy suited to relieve it; and, moreover, the *totality of these its Symptoms* (of this outwardly reflected picture of the internal essence of the disease, that is, of the affection of the vital force), must be the principal or the sole means whereby the disease can make known what remedy it requires—the only thing that can determine the choice of the most appropriate curative agent—and thus, in a word, the *totality of the Symptoms* must be the principal, the *sole* thing, the physician has to take note of in every case of disease, and to *remove* by means of his art."—(*Organon*, p. 113, etc.)

Various writers and physicians have held and believed that, according to these reiterated opinions and statements of Hahnemann, all knowledge of anatomy, of physiology, of pathology, and of most of the other branches of medical science, is in reality useless and unne-

¹ *Organon*, p. 120.

² *Ib.* p. 119.

cessary for the homœopathic practitioner. For if it be the external “*Symptoms alone*,” which the physician requires to ascertain and determine, without any relation to the internal morbid states or diseases upon which these symptoms depend, this simple amount of knowledge could be collected and obtained by a non-medical as well as by a medical person, by a peasant or a priest as well as by a physician.¹

But after having ascertained and noted the “*sum total of the symptoms*” under which any patient may be labouring, the homœopathist has one more duty, and that a most important one, according to his creed, viz., to select from the list of his homœopathic drugs, some medicine which is capable, or which is supposed to be capable, of exciting in the constitution, a series of symptoms more or less perfectly SIMILAR (and the more similar the better) to the diseased symptoms under which the patient is suffering; for like is to be cured by like (*similia similibus curantur*).

When early in his career, Hahnemann adopted the idea that the law of cure consisted in thus exhibiting to the patient some drug, capable of exciting in him an artificial series of symptoms, similar to the diseased symptoms which were present, he next found it necessary, in order to apply this doctrine in practice, to fix the “artificial symptoms” which different drugs were capable of *causing*, and hence, consequently, of *curing*.²

¹ In treating of this point, the author of an editorial paper (Sketch of the Progressive Development of the Homœopathic System), in “The British Journal,” observes, regarding these remarks of Hahnemann on a knowledge of the Symptoms being *solely* necessary, “He (Hahnemann) makes the choice of a remedy a purely empirical act, and gives no scope to the reasoning powers.”—*British Journal of Homœopathy*, for 1849, p. 359. Paterson (the same writer, observes) “considers the mere *number* of the symptoms of disease and medicine that are alike, *sufficient* to guide us in our selection, which would certainly be to reduce the art (homœopathy) to a mere thoughtless mechanical counting.”—*Ibid*, p. 360. Many of the *medical* disciples, however, of homœopathy, especially in this country, have anxiously endeavoured to explain away the truth and force of Hahnemann’s statements, regarding a knowledge of *symptoms* being solely required in homœopathic medicine, and they try to insist on a general knowledge of medical science—physiology, pathology, etc., being actually necessary on the part of those who practise homœopathically,—a doctrine which the alleged successful practice of “the science” by numerous non-medical gentlemen and ladies sufficiently contradicts.

² Perhaps it is right here also to remark, that other therapeutical agencies than mere drugs have been tested and proved by homœopathists. “The effects (it is remarked in the *Homœopathic Journal*) of *animal magnetism*, and of the *passions*, have also been recorded, so as to be available in disease.”—(*Homœopathic Journal* for 1849, p. 349.)

In order, if possible, to fix and determine what special symptoms special drugs were capable of producing, and hence also of removing, Hahnemann and his disciples have had recourse to several different sources of information; as *first*, observing and arguing upon the known effects of some special medicines in particular diseases;—*secondly*, noting the symptoms excited by poisonous doses of drugs on the healthy constitution;—and, *thirdly*, and principally, they have for this purpose made numerous direct experiments or “provings” (as they are termed) of their various drugs, by exhibiting them in large, or in infinitesimal doses, to people, either in a state of health or in a state of disease, and then watching and collecting the effects, or “artificial symptoms” that ensue.

1. The first of these proposed methods of fixing and determining the symptoms produced by any given drug, is certainly an attempt at philosophizing, which is most illogical and untenable. The use of *Iodine* is acknowledged to cure that enlargement of the thyroid gland, known under the name of Goitre; but Iodine, when taken by persons in health, or in sickness, has never been observed to *produce* enlargement of that gland, or any symptoms similar to Goitre. Yet the homœopaths, reasoning on the alleged “universality” of their “immutable law” of “*similia similibus curantur*,” argue, that since Iodine *cures* Goitre, it ought also to *cause* Goitre, though no one ever saw it do so. And hence, in the works on homœopathic drugs and their effects, by Jahr and others, this disease (Goitre) “has,” to use the words of Dr Black, “been classed in the *materia medica* as one of the SYMPTOMS produced by Iodine.” Such an extraordinary instance of reasoning in a circle, does certainly not require one word of comment to expose the extravagance of the logic implied in it.

2. When some substances and medicines are given in large doses, they act as *poisons*, and each produce special effects or symptoms. The homœopathists have collected the symptoms thus resulting from large poisonous doses of particular drugs, and consider them as symptoms, which *infinitesimal* doses also of the drugs ought to *cause*, though to a slighter extent; and hence, of course, ought to *cure*. For example, a poisonous dose of opium produces coma, asphyxia palsy, etc. Hence the homœopathists conceive that infinitesimal doses of opium are indicated in some forms of coma, asphyxia, palsy, etc. :

the drug, though given in infinitesimal doses in these diseases, being still exhibited by the homœopathic practitioner, in such quantity as theoretically to produce an artificial medicinal disease, somewhat *greater* in degree than the morbid coma, asphyxia, palsy, etc., against which it was given. For to cure, in fact, the natural coma, etc., the dose of opium given must be such (to use Hahnemann's own repeated expression) as to produce a medicinal disease, or coma, "somewhat *greater* in degree" than that which pre-existed.—But although five or ten grains of opium, or an ounce or two of laudanum may produce, as a poison, coma, asphyxia, palsy, etc.,—surely, no man can rationally argue and suppose, that a decillionth of a drop of laudanum, or a decillionth of a grain of opium, could, or would, produce any amount whatever of coma, asphyxia, or palsy; not to speak of a degree of coma, asphyxia, palsy, etc., *greater*, as the whole theory of homœopathy requires, than that which the physician is called upon originally to treat.—An ounce or two of Epsom salts in a glass of water may produce diarrhœa, etc.; but does any one believe that a single grain of Epsom salts, duly commixed with the whole waters of Loch Lomond, or of Lake Superior, would impart to each drop, or glassful of these waters, a power either of causing or curing any symptoms of diarrhœa, or any other symptoms whatever? And it is unnecessary to add, that one single grain of the salt in these bodies of water, would not, after all, make the dilution approach by millions of millions of times to the degree of exiguity of the thirtieth dilution of Hahnemann,—that dilution which, as we have already seen, he recommended as the fittest dose of every drug in all diseases, both acute and chronic.

3. But the great mass and body of the so-called data or facts pertaining to the homœopathic Materia Medica, have been procured in quite a different way—viz., as we have stated, by exhibiting the drugs, the symptoms of which were to be ascertained and fixed, either in common or in infinitesimal doses, to healthy or diseased individuals, and noting down the supposed effects or symptoms produced by them in these individuals. The results of these experiments or "provings" of drugs, particularly upon healthy men, are viewed by the homœopathists as matters of immense importance. "Medicines," says Hahnemann, "on which depend man's life and death, disease and health, must be thoroughly and most carefully distinguished from one another, and for this purpose tested by careful

experiments, for the purpose of ascertaining their powers and real effects on the healthy body.”¹ In these experiments or provings, he continues, “depend the exactitude of the whole medical art, and the weal of all future generations of mankind.”²

Deeply impressed with the importance of this department of homœopathic knowledge, Hahnemann himself, at an early period, with various of his disciples, instituted a series of experiments or provings, for the purpose of ascertaining and fixing what special symptoms different special drugs were capable of exciting. In making these experiments, Hahnemann and his disciples first used the ordinary or allopathic doses of the drug, whose powers they wished to ascertain. But afterwards they made their observations with infinitesimal globules and dilutions of it. Frolich used even higher dilutions up to the 200th, with the view of obtaining the required “provings.” At first, and generally, the “provings” were obtained by giving the drugs to persons in a state of perfect health, and noting upon them, or asking them to note, the symptoms which they produced; but latterly, it was supposed by Hahnemann and others, that they might safely ascertain their pathogenetic effects, or medicinal characters, by watching the action of the drugs when given in infinitesimal doses, as curative medicines, to people in different states of disease.³

These “proved” symptoms, then, of particular drugs, form the grand and “invaluable” *data* by which the homœopathic practitioner judges of the applicability of his drugs to the removal of the special diseases, or rather symptoms of disease, which he undertakes to cure; and this constitutes the data by which he attempts to select the infinitesimal dose of the proper remedy from his medicine box. These “provings,” or the supposititious symptoms obtained by these provings, were essential and necessary before the principle of homœopathy could be applied in practice; and on the accuracy and importance of them, the application of homœopathy, as a system of

¹ *Organon*, p. 214.

² *Ibid*, p. 215.

³ “The bulk of the symptoms of the so-called anti-psoric remedies recorded in Hahnemann’s *Chronic Diseases* were derived,—1st, From trials with medicines given in globules of the 30th dilution; and, 2d, From the observations of patients who got the medicine (also in the 30th dilution) for their disease.”—*British Journal of Homœopathy*, Vol. vii. p. 342. In the last edition of his *Organon*, p. 218, he advises decillionths as the best doses for proving the medicinal powers of drugs. See also p. 204, sect. civ.

medicine, altogether and entirely depends. But of what value are these provings? Are the symptoms supposed to be elicited by them, as laid down in homœopathic works on therapeutics, to be looked upon as the true and genuine effects of the drugs swallowed, or are they mere “imaginings” on the part of the individuals experimented upon?—Are these alleged symptoms, in the main, actually facts, or fancies alone? To show the probability or improbability of this, the best course is, perhaps, to quote from one or two of the principal and most modern homœopathic authorities on the subject, the alleged symptoms said to be produced by particular substances or drugs. To show the nature of the special symptoms, alleged to be excited by special medicines, let me adduce, in the way of illustration, the medicinal effects or provings of one or two substances in pretty general use. I shall select first, for this purpose, the effects or symptoms which the homœopathists allege to be produced by doses of common *House-Salt*,—a substance which the whole world of mankind is daily employing, and which Jahr, in his well-known work on homœopathic medicines and materia medica, states to possess properties which indicate its applicability as a medicament in some twenty or thirty different affections.

Common HOUSE or TABLE SALT (*Natrum Muriaticum*, as Jahr terms it), when proved upon a healthy person, can cause above *four hundred and fifty* symptoms, and, consequently, is capable, on the homœopathic principle, of curing many of these symptoms when they occur similarly in different states of disease. According to Jahr, House-salt is usually employed in doses of the 20th or 30th dilution, or, in other words, in doses of the quadrillionth or decillionth of a grain;¹ and the duration of a dose of its effects lasts, in chronic affections, from forty to fifty days. He describes the symptoms supposed to be produced in man by doses of House-salt and of other drugs, under the several heads of “General Symptoms,” and symptoms observed in the “Skin,” “Sleep,” “Fever,” “Head,” “Eyes,” “Ears,” “Nose,” etc., etc. The mere enumeration of the symptoms produced in these various parts by House-salt, occupies about six pages in Jahr’s work. To cite them all would, consequently,

¹ “What a pity (says Dr Curie) the poets were not aware that a single tear-drop contains millions of times more of this powerful medicine than would suffice for the treatment of all the individuals of the human family who have ever had an existence; and yet we rashly add to our food daily, quantities of salt that would require atmospheres of spirit properly to dissolve”!

occupy more space than we can bestow upon them. But the following is an abridged list of some of the principal symptoms which this drug is averred to be capable of producing, and hence also of curing.

Symptoms produced by Common House-Salt.

“Rigidity of all the joints, which crack when they are moved.” “Tendency to experience dislocation, and to strain the back.” “Paralysis.” “Swelling of the Glands.” “Bad effects of a disappointment.” “Great relaxation of all the physical and moral powers after fatigue.” “Great drowsiness during the day.” “Retarded sleep and sleeplessness at night, with ineffectual efforts to go to sleep.” “Agitated sleep, full of vivid and lascivious dreams.” “Frightful dreams of quarrels, murders, fire, thieves, etc.” “At night pains in the back, quivering, apparently of the nerves, frequent emission of urine, headache, colic, asthmatic sufferings, and great anguish of body.” “Typhus fever, with debility.” “Anguish, sometimes during a storm, but especially at night.” “Hatred to persons who have formerly given offence.” “Awkwardness.” “Painful confusion in the head, vertigo, with shocks in the head, and dizziness.” “Sensation on moving the head as if the brain wavered.” “Tendency of the head to become easily chilled.” “Spasmodic closing of the eyelids, especially in the morning, in the evening (during the twilight), and at night.” “Tinkling, ringing, rumbling, and humming in the ears.” “Numbness and insensibility of one side of the nose.” “Boring in the bones of the nose.” “Drawing, like extraction in the teeth, extending into the ear and the throat after a meal, and at night, with swelling of the cheek.” “Speech embarrassed in consequence of the heaviness of the tongue.” “Prolonged sensation as of a hair on the tongue.” “Spasms in the throat.” “Loss of appetite, especially for bread, and repugnance to tobacco smoke.” “Palpitation of the heart, and intermittent or accelerated pulse.” “Disagreeable risings, after partaking of fat food or milk.” “Shocks and clawings in the pit of the stomach.” “Drawing, tension, pressure, pricking, and shootings in the hepatic region.” “Pain and shootings in the splenic region.” “Protrusion of hernia.” “Excoriation between the buttocks, especially when walking.” “Excessive excitement of the amative feeling, or dulness.” “Accumulation of mucus in the larynx in the morning.” “Choking spasmodic cough in bed in the evening.” “Wheezing respiration in bed in the evening.” “Contusive pain and feeling of paralysis in the sacrum, especially in the morning.” “Tearing across the loins and hips.” “Nocturnal pains in the back.” “Digging in the arms, shocks in the elbows.” “Difficulty in bending the joints of the fingers.” “Numerous flaws in the nails.” “Burning in the feet.” “Redness of the great toe.” “Corns on the feet, with shooting and boring pains,” etc. etc. etc.

—(*Jahr's Manual of Homœopathic Medicine*, vol. i. p. 386, *et seq.*)

Let us take another example. CARBONATE of LIME or CHALK, (*Calcareo Carbonica*), exists in most vegetables, and is contained in greater or less quantity—but in doses larger than the Hahnemannian—in almost every water which man drinks. It is found, (says Dr Pereira), even in the purest of waters, viz., in rain water.¹ Carbonate

¹ See Pereira's *Materia Medica*, vol. i. p. 259.

of Lime is, according to Jahr, usually employed in the dose of a decillionth, or in the 30th dilution; and the duration of its effects is fifty days in chronic affections. According to the provings of the homœopathists, Carbonate of Lime is capable of producing above *one thousand* symptoms. Out of this immense number of effects, we select the following as specimens of the symptoms it may cause, and hence may cure.

Symptoms produced by Chalk or Carbonate of Lime.

“Shootings and drawing pains in the limbs, chiefly at night, or in summer, and in change of weather.” “Great tendency to strain the back in lifting.” “Strong desire to be magnetised.” “Emaciation, without failure of appetite. Great plumpness, and excessive obesity.” “On walking in the open air; sadness with tears.” “Visible quivering of the skin from head to foot.” “Encysted tumours which are renewed and suppurate every month.” “Swelling and distortion of the bones.” “Flaws in the fingers.” “Sleeplessness from activity of mind, or in consequence of voluptuous or frightful images which appear as soon as the eyes are shut.” “Snoring during sleep.” “Dreams frequent, vivid, anxious, fantastic, confused, frightful, and horrible.” “Dreams of sick and dead persons.” “At night, agitation, asthmatic suffering, anxiety, beat, pains in the stomach, and in the præcordial region, thirst, beatings of the head, toothache, vertigo, headache, fear of losing the reason, and many other sufferings.” “Quotidian fever towards two o’clock in the afternoon, with yawning and cough, a desire to lie down at least for three hours, after which the hands become cold.” “Tertian fever in the evening.” “Disposition to weep, even about trifles.” “Vexation and lamentation on account of old offences.” “Anxiety and anguish excited by fancies, or frightful stories.” “Disposition to take alarm; Apprehensions.” “Fear of being ill or unfortunate; of sad accidents, of losing the reason; of being infected by contagious diseases.” “Discouragement and fear of death.” “Excessive ill-humour, and mischievous inclination; with obstinacy, and a disposition to take everything in bad part.” “Disgust and aversion to all labour whatever.” “Delirium, with visions of fires, murders, rats and mice, etc.” “Head compressed as if by a vice.” “Dizziness after scratching behind the ear.” “Vertigo after a fit of anger.” “Headache from having wrapped the head in a handkerchief.” “Pains in the head aggravated by spirituous drinks.” “Drawing pains in the right side of the head.” “Piercing in the forehead, as if the head was going to burst.” “Pains of hammering in the head.” “Icy coldness in, and especially on the right side of, the head.” “Movement of the brain in walking.” “Immense size of the head.” “Strong disposition to take cold through the head.” “Smarting on reading during the day, or by candle light.” “Flow of blood from the eyes.” “Lachrymal suppurating fistula.” “Pupils greatly dilated.” “Confusion of sight as if there were a mist.” “Great dazzling from too strong a light.” “Purulent discharge from the ears.” “Polypus in the ears.” “Cracking and detonation in the ears when chewing.” “Fœtid smell from the nose.” “Sense of smell dull, or exceedingly sensitive.” “Fœtid odour before the nose, as if from a dunghill, rotten eggs, or gunpowder.” “Face pale and hollow, with eyes sunk and surrounded by a livid circle.” “Fœtid odour of the teeth.—Fistulous ulcers in the gums of the lower jaw.” “Ranula under the tongue.” “Hawking up of mucus.” “Repugnance to tobacco smoke; desire for

salt things, for wine, and for dainties." "Pressure on the stomach, with squeezing as if from a claw." "Inability to wear tight clothes round the hypochondria." "Incarceration of flatulency." "Pressure of wind towards the inguinal rings, as if hernia were about to protrude." "Before the evacuation, great irascibility. After the evacuation, dejection, and relaxation of the limbs." "Frequent protrusion of hæmorrhoidal excrescences during the evacuations." "Burning eruption in the form of a cluster in the arms." "Wetting the bed." "Polypus of the bladder." "Prolapsus uteri." "Varices in the labia majora." "Pain, as of excoaration and ulceration, in the nipples." "Ulceration of the larynx." "Cough excited by playing on the piano." "Urgent inclination to inspire deeply." "Pains, as of dislocation, in the loins, back, and in the neck, as if caused by a strain." "Swelling and distortion of the spine." "Rigidity of the neck." "Suppuration of the axillary gland." "Swellings of the veins of the hands." "Warts on the arms and on the hands." "Contraction of the fingers." "The legs go to sleep when one is seated," etc. etc. etc.—*Jahr's Manual of Homœopathic Medicine*, vol. i., p. 108, *et seq.*

In his volume on Homœopathic Materia Medica, Dr Jahr records, in a similar way and in a similar style, the symptoms or effects produced, or rather supposed to be produced, by above two hundred drugs used by homœopathists. The "provings" under each, are exactly of the same strange character as those which we have selected. And these two specimens, House-salt and Carbonate of Lime, are selected because they seem just and sufficient examples of the whole. To quote more would be to occupy our space most unnecessarily; especially as we have in former chapters had occasion to cite specimens of these symptoms, as the list of "Moral Symptoms" produced by Flint or Silex (see p. 48); and the religious effects or symptoms of other drugs (see p. 30).¹

Perhaps it is proper to add, in order to show the fantastical affectation of exactitude in these homœopathic provings and symptoms,

¹ We cannot, however, dismiss these provings of homœopathic drugs,—and particularly, of such drugs as house-salt, carbonate of lime and other articles which man of necessity daily employs in his food and drink,—without offering one remark. If this portion of the creed of the homœopathists were true, man would be one of the most unfortunate and miserable of created beings. If, for example, the salt which he must take with his food, and the carbonate of lime which he must take with his drink, were actually capable of producing in the human constitution the hundreds of separate—and in some of their details, severe—symptoms ascribed to them by Hahnemann and his disciples, would not the body of man have been necessarily rendered wretched, and (as they mostly produce various marked "moral symptoms") would not his mind have been rendered sinful, by the very substances which his Creator obliges him to use constantly in the course of the common and requisite nourishment of his frame? If homœopathy were true, would this arrangement not form a strong and incontrovertible argument for sceptics to use, who wished to call in question the bountiful and beneficent arrangements of Providence?

that some of the homœopathic drugs produce, and therefore remove, particular symptoms, only when they occur under particular circumstances or conditions. We have seen above, that carbonate of lime causes, and consequently removes, "cough," when "excited by playing on the piano." A dose of *Rhododendron* causes toothache during a storm, and hence cures toothache when it supervenes during a storm (Jahr's *Materia Medica*, vol. i., p. 488); and Indian *Daphne* causes and cures "toothache after"¹—(P. 217.) The symptoms produced by *Colchicum* "are singularly aggravated by a too brilliant light, and by the smell of pork" (p. 186); and "the smell of fresh eggs, or fat meat," is liable "to occasion loss of consciousness" in those using this drug.—(P. 188.) Borax, or Subborate of Soda, produces and removes "great anxiety when riding in a carriage" (p. 92); and Charcoal generates and relieves "colic produced by the motion of a carriage."—(P. 137.) Doses of Sweet Violet (*Viola Odorata*) cause, and hence cure, an "aversion to all kinds of music, and principally the violin" (p. 608); and common Subcarbonate of Soda, and consequently Soda Water, both causes and cures "trembling when playing on the piano."—(P. 381.) "The majority of the symptoms (produced by *Daphne*) manifest themselves when the moon is waning" (p. 217); and the symptoms following the use of *Silex* or *Flint* are aggravated at the new or full moon—(p. 531). Many of them produce peculiar conditional effects on particular parts; for example, the feet and toes. Thus *Agnus Castus* produces a "tendency to twist the feet when walking on the pavement" (p. 12); Camphor causes "acute drawing in

¹ All who have looked into the volumes of Jahr, the *Materia Medica*, publishing by the English "Hahnemann Publishing Society" (see our next page), and the other works devoted to the history of homœopathic provings and homœopathic drugs, must have felt greatly surprised at the pretended effects, given in a section, duly entered at considerable length, under each important drug, and containing revelations and language of (as the London Medical Gazette describes them) "astounding impurity." What we refer to are—(to use the words of Dr Bushnan)—"neither investigations into the structure nor the functions of the sexual organs, but unparalleled confessions of mental emotions and passions; and that not by sick patients, anxious to obtain health, but by experimenters (male and female) in perfect health, gratuitously supplying these unwonted details."—*Bushnan on Homœopathy*, p. 34. "The medicines must," avers Hahnemann, "be tested on both males and females, in order to reveal the alterations of the health they produce in reference to the sexual system."—*Organon*, p. 217. "We presume," says Dr Bushnan, "we have to thank this law for the abominable and filthy character of many of the homœopathic writings."—*Homœopathy*, p. 33.

the extremities of the toes and under the nails when walking" (p. 121); Crude Antimony produces "callous excrescence at the tips of the toes and under the nail of the great toe" (p. 42); Epsom Salts cause "shootings in the toes," and "tearings in the tips of the fingers at night" (p. 351); Ammoniacum excites "drawing in the middle toe" (p. 23); a preparation of Iron (*Ferrum Magneticum*) makes "the little toe painful, as if it were violently compressed," and causes "ganglion of the foot" (p. 244); Athamantha causes "tearing and burning in the left little toe" (p. 66); Sulphur causes "easy dislocation of the foot when walking" (p. 572); Nux Vomica produces "facility of dislocation of the instep" (p. 422); Carbonate of Soda gives a "tendency to dislocate and sprain the joint of the foot" (p. 385); etc. etc. etc.

Further, it cannot be argued, and must not be supposed, that the work of Jahr, from which I have quoted the above, is not a work of the very highest authority on homœopathy; for it is cited everywhere by homœopathists themselves, as one of their most standard productions on the *Materia Medica*; and two editions of a translation of it into English by Dr Curie have been published in London, and others in America. It is from the second of these London editions that we have quoted the above extracts.

Lately, between twenty and thirty of the principal homœopathic physicians in Great Britain, including Dr Black, Dr Drysdale, Dr Madden, Dr Gully of Malvern, Dr Henderson of Edinburgh, the Rev. T. Wright of Coldstream, etc., have instituted "THE HAHNEMANN PUBLISHING SOCIETY," "for the purpose of publishing scientific and practical works on homœopathy." In 1850, they published their first volume, viz., a "Pathogenetic Cyclopædia," or "Systematic arrangement and analysis of the Homœopathic *Materia Medica*," by Dr Dudgeon of London. This volume contains only the symptoms of "the Disposition, Mind, and Head." I shall select a specimen from this volume, published under such high authorities, to show that the symptoms there described are, in respect of folly, of the same type with those of Jahr. At page 168 to 170 (to take these pages as an example), there is given a series of Delusions, which are capable of being produced, and which it is alleged have been produced in the provings of certain drugs. I shall select a few of these as specimens:—

"Delusion that he is flying" (produced by CAMPHOR). "Delusion that he is riding on an ox" (produced by BELLADONNA). "Delusion that he is a hunter" (produced by

VERATRUM). "Delusion that he is a commanding officer" (effect of a dose of COPPER). "Delusion that he gives the word of command" (effect of BELLADONNA). "Delusion that he has a large business" (effect of PHOSPHORUS). "Delusion that he possesses fine clothes" (effect of SULPHUR). "Delusion that he is a goose" (effect of CONIUM). "Delusion that he is a child" (effect of CICUTA). "Delusion that he has old chairs to mend" (effect of COPPER). "Delusion that he has greens for sale" (effect of COPPER). "Delusion that he is driving sheep" (symptom of ACONITE). "Delusion that his head is larger" (symptom of ZINC). "Delusion that his head is transparent, and that his nose is transparent" (effects of BELLADONNA). "Delusion that his stomach is devoured" (effect of SABADILLA). "Delusion that his legs are cut off" (effect of BARYTA). "Delusion that his fingers and toes are cut off" (symptom of MUSK). "Delusion that his feet are in his brain" (effect of AMPHISBENA). "Delusion that he is killed, roasted, and being eaten" (a symptom of STRAMONIUM). "Delusion that he is about to be married" (symptom of HENBANE). "Delusion that he is pursued by evil spirits, and that a dog is biting him" (effect of STRAMONIUM). "Delusion that thieves are in the house" (symptom of ARSENIC). "Delusion that men are swine" (a symptom of HENBANE). "Imaginary vision of cats" (an effect of ÆTHUSA). "Imaginary vision of rabbits" (effect of STRAMONIUM). "Pretending to crack nuts" (symptom of HENBANE). "Pretending to count money" (symptom of BELLADONNA). "Pretending to drive away peacocks" (a symptom of HYOSCYAMUS). "Eats his shoes" (an effect of VERATRUM). "Tries to climb up the stove" (effect of HENBANE). "Dancing in the Churchyard" (a symptom of STRAMONIUM). "Inclination to pull people's noses" (a symptom produced by MERCURY); etc. etc. etc.

It is surely unnecessary to dwell further on these "provings,"—the making of which is, according to Hahnemann, a portion of the homœopathic system that "is of all others THE MOST IMPORTANT; which is to form the basis of the only true healing art (of homœopathy); and which demands the greatest moral certainty and trustworthiness" (*Organon*, p. 228). For, as he again observes (p. 215), "the weal of all future generations of mankind, and the exactitude of the (homœopathic) medical art," depend upon the accuracy of these provings. And I willingly leave every unprejudiced reader to judge for himself of their actual accuracy, and of the consequent amount of reliance that can possibly be placed upon a system of medicine, which rests and relies upon the truth of these imaginary "proved" effects of drugs as one of its most essential and vital foundations.

CHAPTER XI.

EXPERIENCE AS A TEST OF HOMŒOPATHY; SAME TEST CLAIMED BY ALL FORMS OF CHARLATANRY; FALLACIES; CURATIVE EFFECTS OF VIS MEDICATRIX; OF REGIMEN AND DIET; OF MEDICAL FAITH, ETC.

ONE important circumstance has always formed the ground-work and basis of the temporary success and glorification of "the thousand and one" infallible and universal cures, and systems of cure, that have been propounded to the world during the last two or three thousand years. Fortunately for all these irregular and exclusive systems of cure, a large majority of the attacks of disease, both acute and chronic, to which the human body is subject, can be overcome and recovered from by the sanative powers of the constitution alone. In other words, Nature alone can cure most of these attacks, uninfluenced and unaided by the employment of any medicinal means; and sometimes in despite of these means.

In a preceding extract (p. 33), we have found it correctly stated, in regard to homœopathy, that its "so-called *cures* were *recoveries* from ordinary ailments by the efforts of nature." But it is doubtless this apparently successful treatment of cases submitted to homœopathic doses which misleads many a mind unacquainted with the nature of medical evidence. The mere successful natural *termination*, however, of a case, or of a series of cases, is no sufficient criterion of the successful medical *treatment* of them; or, in other words, of the reality of their *cure*. Every quack medicine, from the universal panacea of the old Elixir of Life, or Berkeley's Tar-water, or Perkin's Tractors,—down to Solomon's Balm of Gilead, or Mr Lee's Brandy-and-Salt,—or Parr's, or Morrison's, or Holloway's pills; and every quack system of medicine, from the doctrine of Charms and Signatures, —down to the modern Thirst-cure, Hunger-cure, and Grape-cure of the Germans, or the prevailing systems of Chronothermism,

Coffinism, Kinesipathy,¹ Hydropathy, Isopathy, &c. &c.,—has, as every one knows, its hundreds or thousands of supposed cures or coincidences to boast of. Of the propounders and patrons of these diversified universal cures and systems of cures, one and all, confidently appeal to the results of so-called “*Experience*” in proof of the special efficacy and success of their own special and exclusive system of treatment; and it would be strange indeed, and a very unusual exception to a very general law, if homœopathy had not also its numerous alleged cures, and its results of “*Experience*” also to adduce and boast of.

“*Pure experience* (it is averred and argued by Hahnemann) is

¹ “A well-digested history of the ‘irregular orders’ of medical practitioners would not (observes a late writer) be uninteresting. It would present to us a curious list of Priests and Nobles, Philosophers, Simpletons, and Knaves. Even Royalty itself would not be absent from it.” Witness the royal touch for the King’s Evil. (See *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxi. p. 86.) One fact in the history of irregular practices is illustrated in Kinesipathy, viz., the tendency of the same form of universal cure to be reproduced in different ages and in different places. According to the evidence of Pliny, Prodicus, a disciple of Hippocrates, first adopted, as a general method of cure, rubbing, champooing, and movements (or Kinesipathy); and this method of cure was again temporarily brought into vogue in Rome in Pliny’s own time. Lately it has been revived as a new and universal method of cure by Ling of Sweden, and others. The author of the article I have quoted from, reputed to be Sir Benjamin Brodie, gives the following history of a Kinesipath who, within the present century, deluded for a time the people of London with this supposed universal mode of cure.

“A young man (says he) who had been brought up as a journeyman-cooper, was instructed by his mother in the art of *champooing*. Champooing and other modes of friction have been long known as useful remedies in certain cases of stiff joints and weakened limbs, and as a substitute for exercise in bed-ridden patients; and there are many respectable females, of the class of nurses, in London, who practise the art very successfully, and think themselves amply remunerated for their labour by earning a few shillings daily. But this youth was more fortunate. One or two cures, which it was reported that he had made, caused him to be talked of at every dinner-table. It was believed that he had made a prodigious discovery in the healing art—that champooing, performed according to his method, was a remedy for all disorders. Not only those to whose cases the treatment was really applicable, but those to whose cases it was not applicable at all—patients with diseases of the hip and spine, of the lungs and liver—patients with the worst diseases, and patients with no disease whatever—went to be champooed. The time of the artist being fully occupied, rose in value, and we have no doubt that we do not over-estimate his gains in saying that, for one or two years, his receipts were at the rate of L.6000 annually. Matters went on thus for three or four years, when the delusion ceased about as suddenly as it had leapt into vigour, and the champooer found himself all at once deprived of his vocation.”—*Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxi. p. 90.

the only, the infallible oracle of medicine," and the "idle declamations (of opponents) must cease before the dieta of infallible *experience*." In this strain, in former times, Bishop Berkeley strenuously, and apparently soundly, argued regarding the universal curative effect of Tar-water; so argued Dr Solomon regarding his Balm of Gilead; Mr Perkins regarding his Metallic Tractors; Dr Morrison regarding his Pills; Mr Lee regarding the effects of the internal and external use of Brandy-and-Salt, &c. &c. In the present day we have exactly the same proof of "infallible *experience*" everywhere as earnestly and anxiously repeated—by Dr Dickson regarding the results of his Chronothermal treatment; by Mr Coffin regarding his courses of Lobelia, &c.; by Ling regarding the cure of all diseases by rubbing and movements; by Priessnitz regarding the cure of all affections by the internal and external use of cold water; by Lutz in relation to the treatment of all diseases upon the Isopathie principle, "*aequalia aequalibus curantur*,"—"the same is cured by the same;" by Hahnemann in relation to the treatment of all diseases upon the homœopathie principle of "*similia similibus curantur*,"—"like is cured by like." The promulgators, pupils, patrons, and patients of each of these diverse universal systems of cure, are, like Hahnemann and his followers, all equally ready and equally entitled to appeal to the results of "pure EXPERIENCE as the only, the infallible oracle" and criterion of the particular medical doctrine, and exclusive mode of cure, which, for the time being, they severally and zealously happen to favour and follow.

To decide amidst so many very strong and yet very opposite asseverations, may not always be an easy task for trusting and credulous minds, and particularly with those who are unacquainted with the nature of medical evidence. Indeed, with the non-medical public, the difficulty of distinguishing what is a cure by nature alone, and what is a cure by nature assisted or controlled by art, makes up the sum of the difficulty of distinguishing between true and spurious medical treatment. And in solving this problem, it is far too frequently forgotten, that men labouring under disease, even the most acute, and consequently much more so when suffering under slighter ailments, do not as a general rule die, even when totally and entirely left without any medicinal treatment whatever. When reasoning on the efficacy of different medicines and different modes of cure, the mind is constantly liable to fall into the greatest errors, by neglecting this leading truth. For when

a man, in a state of disease, takes, for the purpose of curing that disease, a millionth or a decillionth of a grain of oyster-shell, or sulphur, or other homœopathic drug, he comes—not very unnaturally, but very illogically—to attribute his cure to the infinitesimal dose of oyster-shell or sulphur, from being unaware that the disease, if left to itself, does very often spontaneously get well, and was virtually left entirely to itself when he took his Hahnemannian dose of oyster-shell or sulphur.¹ While the homœopathic patient anxiously attributes his cure to the infinitesimal dose which he has swallowed, the cure is in reality effected by the natural sanative powers of the constitution (the old *vis medicatrix nature*); or by nature aided, not by medicine, but by Medical Faith; or assisted by proper Regimen

¹ “The evidence that is requisite to prove or disprove any proposition in the science of medicine, is of a peculiar kind. It differs entirely from that species of proof which satisfies a court of law. Both direct and circumstantial evidence, which would leave no doubt in the breasts of judges and juries, have often not the slightest tendency to render a medical fact even probable. The declarations, and even the oaths, of the most conscientious, disinterested, and able men, are all insufficient. The reason of this is, that few men, even those of considerable capacity, distinguish accurately between opinion and fact. When a man asserts he has been *cured* of a particular disease by a certain drug, he is apt to think he is declaring a fact which he knows to be true; whereas this assertion includes two opinions, in both of which he may be completely mistaken. The first is an opinion of his having *had* the disease specified; the second, that the medicine employed *removed* the disease. Most people are convinced that they are acquainted with the malady they are afflicted with; they consider it a mere matter of fact; and when they are cured, they have as little doubt of the remedy that accomplished it. This belief is often strengthened by the confident declarations, and specious behaviour, of the person who exhibits the remedy; and if the person possesses gratitude, this also heightens the delusion. He is thus easily prevailed upon to swear positively both to the disease and the remedy, as if they were both plain facts obvious to the senses; whereas, both the one and the other are frequently beyond the reach of human knowledge. Such cases, to the truth of which the patients will often take their oath, form no stronger presumption of these facts, than the affidavits that are daily sworn to of consumption, gout, or cancer being cured, prove that a specific for these distempers has been discovered. This species of unintentional perjury has been very common during the last century in every part of Europe; and the more improbable the fact is, the more numerous are the affidavits, and the more respectable the signatures. Clergymen, judges, and peers, are daily swearing, that they have been cured of incurable diseases; but the meanest apothecary smiles with contempt when he reads their splendid testimonials. . . . Yet if any one should attempt, by investigating each particular case, to refute it, he would soon discover the impossibility of succeeding. I have been requested, on various occasions, to make such researches, and generally found that the patients were completely convinced of the truth of the attestation, whether the remedy was physic, magnetism, or a tractor. In short, they were ready to take the most solemn oath to what was quite impossible to be true.”—*Moore's Reply to the Antivaccinists*.

and strict Diet ;—the last, great and potent auxiliary means, of which all homœopathists very properly and powerfully avail themselves.

It is superfluous to adduce any lengthened proofs or observations of the direct curative effects and influence which these means are capable of exercising upon the diseased human economy, altogether independently of the exhibition and aid of drugs or medicine; and in truth homœopathists trust to these measures alone when using their billionths, decillionths, etc., of a grain—such doses being, as we have already seen, so very infinitesimal, that they cannot, by any rational possibility, have any influence upon the body.

On the all-important agency, at least, of the *vis medicatrix nature*, it is unnecessary to dwell. All sects of physicians are willing to allow that, were it not for the aid afforded by the natural sanative powers of the constitution, their unassisted drugs would seldom or never restore the economy from a state of disease to a state of health. And, in many cases, the self-rectifying power of the *vis medicatrix* is such, that the office of the physician becomes comparatively of a negative type; and consists more in carefully averting the different conditions which may interfere with nature's operations, than in indirectly interfering with them; his duty amounting to a course of active prevention rather than a course of active cure.

And, again, the more physicians have studied the remedial efficacy in disease of mere Regimen—(including, as it does, the non-medicinal, un-drugged regulation of all the various functions of the body, as affected by rest, or exercise, by temperature, by air, by mental excitement or quietude, etc. etc.)—the more have they become convinced of the influence and importance of the due working, and proper control of the different physiological functions of the economy, as a means for restoring the body from its various morbid states to a state of health. The regulation of the Diet alone (forming one single subsidiary department of the general doctrine of the Regimen), is indeed sometimes in itself sufficient to arrest the action and progress of disease. In the first day of a Catarrh, for instance, simple abstinence from fluids generally effects a rapid and speedy cure; a proper vegetable diet is sufficient, in most instances, to remove the most aggravated cases of Scorbutus; the inculcation of a due animal diet forms, in the same way, the sheet-anchor of the physician in the treatment of Diabetes; and there are few cases of Constipation, or of Dyspepsia, however chronic or obstinate, that cannot be ultimately rectified by dietetic means alone, and without the aid

of medicine. Indeed, by the proper regulation of the diet in sickness, "more good," as was long ago sagaciously remarked by Dr Arbuthnot, "and less mischief, will be done in Acute Distempers, than by medicines properly and seasonably administered; and GREAT CURES may be effected in Chronical Distempers, by a proper Regimen and Diet." "A change of diet and of mode of life (observes the latest writer on the subject—1852) will alter *entirely* the character of the urine, and, of course, of the blood. Hence the *supreme* value of diet and regimen as means of *cure*, acknowledged by all experienced physicians."¹

In these "Chronical Distempers," Hahnemann lays down strict and excellent dietetic rules,² merely in order, as he pretends, "that the cure (by the infinitesimal dose of a drug) may NOT be obstructed." And we have no doubt, that if patients could be induced to observe these rules, they would very often indeed be found amply sufficient for the cure of many chronic ailments.³

Farther, that mere simple "*Medical Faith*," independently of the introduction of any medicine whatever into the system, can and does exert a mighty influence over the progress of disease, so as often to modify, and often entirely remove it, is a fact of which the past records of medicine furnish us with the most ample proofs; and

¹ Dr Gregory's Hand-book of Organic Chemistry, p. 505.

² Hahnemann, in his *Organon*, p. 309, gives the following list of things forbidden:—Coffee, tea, beer, drinks containing aromatics, spiced chocolate, scents and perfumeries of all sorts, tooth-powders (liquid or pulverised) containing aught medicinal, perfumed bags, high-seasoned meats, ices and pastry, flavoured with aromatics, all herbs and roots having medicinal properties, cheese, meats too long kept, pork, goose, duck, too young veal. The following things are also prohibited:—Over-indulgence at table of all kinds, too much salt or sugar, all spirituous drinks, overheated rooms, sedentary life, passive exercise on horseback, or in a carriage, sleep after dinner, sexual pleasures, exciting books, uncleanness, anger, vexation, seorn, exciting play, over-exertion of mind, marshy districts, confined localities where the air is stagnant, &c.—*Dr Forbes' Review*, vol. xxii., p. 232.

³ Thus, "A gentleman who had been out of health some time, and had paid but little attention to the direction of his medical attendant, was advised to consult a homœopathic physician; he did so, and remained under his care six weeks, the doctor making his visit as often as he pleased: he improved in health—in short, was cured. 'Now,' exclaimed his friend, 'you henceforth stand up in defence of homœopathy.' 'Not at all; I am more than ever convinced of its fallacies and humbug. I have followed the plan of diet, etc.; which plan was often urged upon me by my former medical friend, but not one of the billionth powders or globules have I taken.'"—*Medical Gazette* for January 20, 1843.

it is a principle of which Hahnemann and his followers have taken the fullest advantage. The powerful effect and success of simple "medical faith" upon the progress of disease, is testified to us, for example, by the innumerable cures in former times, of almost all maladies, by the supposed medicinal influence of Amulets, Charms, Holy Wells, Relics, Incantations, and Sorcery.—All the varieties of scrofula, with its variously afflicted subjects, "swollen and ulcerous, the mere despair of surgery," were alleged to be cured in England from the time of Edward the Confessor, down to the time of Queen Anne, by a single touch of the hand of the reigning monarch. And there are records of upwards of 92,000 such patients touched by Charles the Second alone; "for the king," says Wiseman, "cureth more in one year than all the Chirurgeons of London have done in an age." The effect of "medical faith" in the efficacy of the touch of the hand of Valentine Greatrakes was such, that he not only cured by it, like the reigning sovereign, all varieties of scrofula, but also ague, epilepsy, deafness, etc. etc. Palsies, and various nervous maladies, as blindness, deafness, etc., were apparently often, and almost magically, removed in the patients who had "medical faith" in the prayers of Prince Höhenlö^h. The old and numerous cures of Gassner, of Francis of Paris, of the smith's child of Kehrberg, &c., are of the same stamp. In former times in Scotland, patients affected with plague, with hydrophobia, etc., fancied that they cured themselves of these maladies by drinking a draught or two of the water in which the celebrated talisman, or "Lee Penny," of Lanarkshire was dipped; and the magistrates of Newcastle, who borrowed this Lee talisman for the use of their townsmen during one of the last English plagues, offered, in the 17th century, to forfeit L.6000 for the permanent possession of this healing "stane set in silver." Professor Trousseau states that a Parisian, who determined upon making his fortune by medical charlatanry, secretly selected as his panacea, distilled water as the most innocuous substance which he could use for his purpose. But he received so many attestations of the great potency of his medicine, and of the wonderful cures which it had worked, that at last even he himself became convinced, and died in the belief of the universal efficacy of the waters of the Seine.¹ The besieged inhabitants of Breda, when greatly invalided

¹ Dr Routh informs us that he himself tried experimentally the effects of medical faith in some fifty or sixty cases, giving the patients nought but coloured water. "My plan (says he) was to employ three kinds of coloured water—red, yellow, and

and bed-ridden with scurvy, etc., were rapidly restored to health and strength, by drinking of the solution of a supposed very precious drug, smuggled in small quantity into the town, for their especial benefit, by the Prince of Orange; and which drug was subsequently confessed to be only a little coloured water. Towards the beginning of the present century, all kinds of human aches and pains were relieved in great numbers of patients, by the approach of Perkins' metallic Tractors to the suffering parts; and with equally signal success, by the approach to these parts of pieces of wax, wood, etc., made in imitation of the shape and colour of the tractors of metal.¹ A paralytic man was cured in a fortnight, by Sir H. Davy placing daily under his tongue the bulb of a pocket thermometer, the palsied

blue; to work upon the imagination of my patients, describing this water to be a deadly poison, and having it labelled accordingly, giving express caution to keep the medicine from the children. I invented a series of symptoms as likely to follow—from 20 to 30 drops a dose. It is but right to state, that in many cases the result was null, no effect appearing to have been produced. In some patients, however, chiefly neuralgic cases and weak-minded individuals, there was. In one case this coloured water produced such alarming symptoms that I was sent for in a great hurry to see my patient, a strong well-built man about twenty-five years old, labouring under some dyspeptic affection. I was informed that after every dose of the medicine taken (which consisted of 30 drops of water coloured with the compound lavender tincture), syncope, with convulsive movement, followed. A diminution to 20 drops re-assured my patient, and the fits did not occur again. My colleague, Dr Taylor, found coloured water produce such distressing symptoms in a female, that he was obliged to omit it. If such effects were produced among *out-patients*, by whom all dietetic regimen was neglected, where rest and quiet were not enforced, what good effects might not have followed the employment of coloured water with these adjuvants!—*Fallacies of Homœopathy*, p. 24.

¹ I have already, in a preceding foot note (p. 37), spoken of the general belief some half century ago, in the great medicinal efficacy and power, in inflammations, rheumatisms, etc., etc., of the two small pieces of metal, which Perkins sold in great numbers, and at exorbitant prices, under the name of Metallic Tractors. Dr Haygarth, and Mr Smith in this country, and Schumacher in Germany, showed that they could produce equally marvellous effects in the same cases, and the same diseases, with "false tractors," made of wood, etc., provided only the patients themselves had sufficient medical faith in the powers of the tractors, and were not aware that the tractors were false ones. The sudden relief of pains, the restoration of power to rheumatic and paralysed parts, the affection of the pulse, etc., were as marked, if not more marked, in these experiments, when the false tractors were pointed at, or held to diverse parts of the body, than has been witnessed, by the most earnest homœopathist, as a result of any of his infinitesimal doses. In one case they produced an increase of pain instead of relieving it, the patient declaring that, after their use (that is, the use of *nothing*) for four minutes, "he was in more pain than when the surgeon took five pieces of bone from his leg, in a compound fracture, in Wales;" and his pulse was raised to 120 beats a minute.

man believing all the time that the "benign influence" which he immediately felt through him, was owing to his inhaling some infallible specific gas ; which, however, was never administered to him. In fact, the past history of medicine and mankind is full of instances illustrating in this way the sanative effects of mere medical faith. In the interesting travels in Tartary, Thibet, etc., lately published by the French missionary Huc, a sufficiently striking modern instance is mentioned in relation to the general treatment of diseases by the Lamas of Tartary, who have the exclusive practice of medicine allotted to them. The Lama physician, observes M. Huc, is his own apothecary, and gives the specific befitting each case in which his advice is applied for. "The Tartar pharmacopœia rejecting all mineral chemistry, the Lama remedies consist entirely of vegetables pulverised, and either infused in water or made up into pills. If the Lama doctor happens not to have any medicine with him, he is by no means disconcerted ; he writes the *names* of the remedies upon little scraps of paper, moistens the papers with his saliva, and rolls them up into pills, which the patient tosses down with the same perfect confidence as though they were genuine medicaments. *To swallow* (adds M. Huc) *the NAME of a remedy, or the REMEDY itself, comes (say the Tartars) to precisely the same thing.*"¹

The prayers of Prince Hohenloe, the tractors of Perkins, etc., certainly produced, through the agency of medical faith, most wondrous effects, in rapidly restoring motory powers to the weak, lame, and bed-ridden. But last year, Dr Horace Green, when visiting Edinburgh, informed me and others of an instance in which a homœopathic physician effected a more speedy and extraordinary cure than any of which Hohenloe, Perkins, or any of that class could ever boast. A lady had been useless and bed-ridden for years ;—the spine was her own alleged seat of disease ; and endless measures had been tried to restore her to health and the power of standing and walking ; but they had all been tried in vain. In consequence of the earnest advice and glowing representations of some female homœopathic friends, she had been long anxious to ascertain if homœopathic treatment could be of any use in her distressing case ; but her husband refused to give his consent, believing homœopathy to be "a discreditable delusion and a quackery." Fortunately, however, for herself, her husband left her for a week or two on a

¹ Illustrated National Library Edition, p. 75.

sporting expedition; and, as soon as he set off with his gun and dogs, she seized hold of the opportunity which she had long desired, of consulting a celebrated homœopathic physician. The physician listened long;—examined into her case most attentively;—made before her written entries and memoranda, regarding all her symptoms and sufferings; and at last, on considering the whole, confidently assured her that doubtlessly he could send her a drug that corresponded with her disease, and which would produce such effects the first day, other effects the next, etc.,—and that, before her husband returned, she would be able to walk and enjoy life. The patient diligently swallowed the globules; all the predicted effects duly followed; and when her husband returned home, he was astonished and overjoyed to find his sick and bed-ridden wife up and well. The crime of consulting a homœopathist against his declared wish was readily forgiven, seeing the results of the homœopathic treatment had been so happy and beneficial; but he asked for a sight of the wonder-working “globules” that had produced so gladsome a change in his wife’s health, and in his own prospects of domestic happiness. On being shown the globules, the acute and loving husband earnestly desired them to be most carefully preserved and locked up, lest, perchance, his partner’s distressing ailments should at any future time return. He then went and informed his usual family physician of this secret, that his wife had got well under a homœopathist; adding, that still he did not believe in homœopathy itself, for he found the globules which she had swallowed were not homœopathic drugs, but specimens of some small percussion pellets that were to be sent to him for examination (his gun being one formed for the use of the percussion-pellet, in preference to the percussion-cap), but which had not arrived at his house till some time after he had left. The servant had mistaken the packet of pellets for the packet of homœopathic globules; and the lady had swallowed them under the belief that she was swallowing the homœopathic physician’s medicine.

When the homœopathic practitioner treats a case by infinitesimal doses of homœopathic drugs, and abstains from giving openly or surreptitiously the ordinary allopathic drugs, in their ordinary or in a concealed form, he virtually trusts the cure of his patient to nature, regimen, and medical faith; for no one can rationally believe that the swallowing or the smelling of a billionth, or a decillionth, of a

grain, can have any possible influence, good, bad, or indifferent. And there is no doubt that Hahnemann himself knew thoroughly the curative powers of nature—time, regimen, and diet; and, in his own heart, mainly or entirely depended upon these, and upon the important therapeutical influence of due medical faith on the part of those who placed themselves under his treatment,—a medical faith which he zealously enhanced and increased in their minds, by investing his practice in the solemnity of what his followers, in the simplicity of their innocence, were taught to look upon as really a very learned and a very scientific theory of disease and cure.

Dr Schubert of Dramburg, who was personally intimate with him, and his ideas of cure, distinctly tells us (see p. 17), that Hahnemann had a thorough conviction, that all curable diseases might, under proper attention to diet, be removed by means of nature alone, or by the *vis medicatrix*. We have in a preceding page, (p. 62), seen Hahnemann himself averring, in the last edition of his *Organon*, that he had cured all his patients for a year, by making them *smell* mere dried globules containing the decillionth of a grain; and when he did so, no rational man can resist the belief, that Hahnemann was at least wise enough to know, that he was trusting to nature and regimen alone, and not to medicine. Further, that Hahnemann was fully acquainted with the sanative powers of simple *medical faith*, is a matter of as little doubt. “He exacted unlimited confidence on the part of his patients, well knowing (says Dr Schubert), that it was the important secret of life and death” in the cases he was treating. “Hahnemann never hesitated (he further observes) to promise recovery to *every* patient, without concerning himself about the nature of the malady.” The boldness and effrontery with which he always unhesitatingly and dogmatically proclaimed the infallibility of this and that homœopathic remedy, in the cure of this and that disease, constituted the necessary means by which he created this feeling of *medical faith* on the part of his followers and patients. In some preceding pages we have had occasion to quote, from his *Lesser Writings*, one or two specimens of his unhesitating and characteristic power of assertion with regard to particular remedies and modes of cure, as in regard to the smelling of a quintillionth solution of gold, at once curing a person of morbid despondency (see p. 64); and his works are full of similar cool averments. In one, for example, of the last essays which he published, he displays this power of reckless and characteristic assertion, to a degree of which

it would be difficult to find a parallel, even in the “most irregular” medical bills and newspaper advertisements, of the present day. He boasts, in the essay to which I refer, that he could so far reverse the laws of nature, that if his directions about the use of camphor, in malignant epidemic cholera, were followed, “*every* patient (attacked with that disease) would be *infallibly* restored within a couple of hours, as (to continue his own assertion in his own words) the most undeniable facts and instances prove.”¹ And we have been informed of one instance in which, towards the commencement of the last cholera epidemic in Scotland, a disciple of Hahnemann declared, that he himself had already cured above seventy cases of the disease, in a community where not fifty cases in all had as yet occurred to the two or three hundred physicians practising there. Everywhere also, through Hahnemann’s works, he avows to his patients, and to his pupils, that while the legitimate system of medicine is an old “mischievous, non-healing art,” which “tortures patients, wastes their strength and fluids, and shortens their lives,” his homœopathic mode of cure is “the only true” method of restoring the economy from disease to health,—“is a salutary and blessed business,” the only method by which patients can be “really, rapidly, permanently and evidently cured,” etc. etc.,—no doubt most thoroughly aware how much the requisite implicit *medical faith*, on the part of the patients and pupils of homœopathy, required to be constantly excited, stimulated, and invigorated by such lusty denunciations, and such bold and boundless assertions.

But “does not”—(to use Hahnemann’s own sufficiently true and expressive words)—“does not such pretension reach the CLIMAX of boastful charlatanry and mendacious delusion?”—(*Lesser Writings*, p. 802.) We do confess we conscientiously think so.

¹ See *Lesser Writings*, p. 854, where, as in our text, “*every*” and “*infallibly*” are printed in italics.

CHAPTER XII.

SUPPOSED STATISTICAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOUR OF HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE; COMPARISON OF CASES ADMITTED AT FLEISCHMANN'S HOMŒOPATHIC HOSPITAL AND EDINBURGH INFIRMARY; MORTALITY FROM PNEUMONIA UNDER EXPECTANT, HOMŒOPATHIC, AND ALLOPATHIC TREATMENT, ETC.

OF late years, various disciples of Hahnemann have boldly adventured upon a new course in proof of the truth of homœopathy, and in evidence of their belief that infinitesimal doses have actually a direct and a positive power upon the human body in the cure of disease. Led by Dr Fleischmann of Vienna, homœopathists now constantly and confidently appeal to the comparative mortality observed in allopathic and homœopathic practice, in favour of the efficiency of their particular system of medicine. The statistical returns, it is averred, of homœopathic hospitals¹ and dispensaries

¹ I have not spoken in this chapter of the alleged statistics of their *private* practice, paraded from time to time by different homœopathic physicians before their patients and the public; for it is generally impossible, even were it proper, to trace in any way the true results of their private practice, except when, as happens from time to time, another physician is called in towards the last hours of a homœopathic patient's life; or when some public examination of the cases and statements happens to be officially called for. An instance of the latter kind lately occurred in England; and a sufficiently significant instance it appears to be. A notice of it is published in the last number of the *British and Foreign Medical Review*. A homœopathic practitioner at Huddersfield "circulated amongst all classes of the population in Huddersfield, with comments admirably calculated to deceive the public," a statement of the relative success of the treatment of Epidemic Cholera in that town by homœopathic, as compared with allopathic means; and he pledged himself for the accuracy of his report. To give the report a greater appearance of truth, he circulated a table of Cholera cases treated in Huddersfield during the last epidemic,—the table professing to contain the name, age, residence, and treatment of each patient attacked, with the results. And the general results were these:—"Number of cases treated allopathically, 20; recoveries, 2; deaths, 18. Number of cases treated homœopathically, 8; recoveries, 8; deaths, 0." "Will," asks the Reviewer, "our readers credit that this statement is a lie,—ingenious, it is true,—but a lie from beginning to end? Yet it is so." And the Reviewer proceeds to show the truth of this allegation by the facts as to the epidemic of Cholera at Huddersfield, collected and published by Dr Taylor, formerly Professor of Clinical Medicine, University College; Dr Taylor's report being

show a great superiority, in point of practical success, over the statistical returns of similar institutions superintended by ordinary physicians. More especially, late homœopathic writers and disciples have strongly insisted upon the alleged few deaths, and numerous cures, which the official returns of Dr Fleischmann of Vienna show to have occurred under his care, during a succession of years, in the Homœopathic Hospital of the Sisters of Charity. This hospital was the first homœopathic hospital of any extent which was instituted; and, some years ago, a statistical report of 6524 cases treated within its wards were given, under Dr Fleischmann's own authority, to the English public.¹ And that report affords (as is at least continually averred by the practitioners and patrons of homœopathy) the most conclusive and unquestionable proof of the superiority of homœopathy over ordinary legitimate medicine, by displaying results in practice that are "far beyond the reach of any other known method of treatment." But a very slight consideration of the subject will readily show how reckless and impolitic this assertion is; and few, I believe, can examine the facts in Dr Fleischmann's celebrated and "conclusive" returns, without arriving at the opinion that, taking into view the general mild character of the cases treated, his selection of the patients, and of the diseases to be treated, etc., the ratio of mortality presented by these returns is not, as the homœopaths fondly urge, remarkably small, but, on the contrary (as the latest writer on the subject has designated it), "enormously high."

Dr Fleischmann's Hospital Returns were, as has been already stated, given some time ago to the English public, to the extent of 6501 cases. These 6501 cases were treated by him in the hospital in question from the year 1835 to the end of 1843. The general mortality from all diseases, among these 6501 patients, was 6·4 per cent.; or, in other words, 1 out of every 16 died.

characterised by the Registrar-General as "in itself a model, which the local inquirers should consult." For the particulars, see the *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review* for April 1852, pp. 479-481. Three or four years ago, at a meeting in London of the medical Homœopathic Society, Mr Cameron, a homœopathic practitioner, with rare honesty boldly told his colleagues that he "thought we (homœopaths) gained little by CONSTANTLY trumpeting forth our extraordinary cures, and CONCEALING our failures. He felt assured that an opposite course would be preferable." See his observations in *British Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. v., p. 389.

¹ See Introduction to the Study of Homœopathy, by Drs Drysdale and Russell, pp. 214-229.

Now, we at once freely grant, that in the large and crowded metropolitan hospitals of London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, etc., the ordinary mortality is often, or indeed usually, much higher, and varies from 5 to 12 per cent.¹ Mr Thomson,² some years ago, showed that the average mortality of fourteen large English hospitals (including several in London) amounted to 7·7 per cent.; or was somewhat more than 1 per cent. higher than the mortality in Fleischmann's Homœopathic Hospital. The average mortality of the largest hospitals in London, during the four years from 1846 to 1850 inclusive, was 8·4 per cent.;³ or nearly 2 per cent. higher than in Fleischmann's Hospital. Still, we repeat, the ratio of mortality in Fleischmann's Hospital was "enormously high;" for the class of cases treated in his wards was *greatly less severe and fatal* than the class of cases admitted into these other allopathic

¹ "Every one (observes Dr Gairdner) familiar with the routine of hospitals, knows well that a large, well-known, and accessible institution, such as the recognised general hospital of a metropolis, will inevitably attract into its wards the most desperate, the most poverty-stricken, the most abandoned and forlorn cases, to be found within its range; and will, by the very fact of withdrawing these, tend to improve the mortality-list of other smaller and less central institutions. The Hôtel Dieu at Paris, the Santo Spirito at Rome, Guy's and others in London, attain in this way a high ratio of mortality, simply by the fact that these are the popular hospitals of their respective districts. Indeed, their influence is often felt in this respect far beyond the limits of the town in which they are placed. There is not a shadow of a doubt that the principal hospitals of London, Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, absorb, so to speak, a large portion of the mortality of multitudes of provincial hospitals all over this kingdom." "If (he continues) I were to give a formula for the arrangements of an hospital designed to exhibit a low rate of mortality, it would be this:—Choose your site well; let it be not *in*, but *near*, a large city, having already hospital accommodation on a prodigious scale, well known to the poorest classes of the community, and adapted to their wants; let the distance from the centre be such (say three miles) as will keep back the extremely abject and the dangerously diseased, either through want of knowledge of your institution, or want of power to reach it; let the arrangements be so perfect as to contrast favourably with the older hospitals, and to attract the valetudinarians, whose illnesses and means permit them to avail themselves of its superior accommodation; and, finally, let some special practice be pursued, in order to enlist the sympathies of rich or idle *dilettanti*, who will know how to fill your wards with the sort of cases suitable for your experiment. THIS IS PRECISELY THE PICTURE OF THE VIENNA HOMŒOPATHIC HOSPITAL, which has the amazing effrontery to call upon us to compare its peddling *experiments* with the great labours of pure beneficence, of which general hospitals of this and other countries furnish examples."—*Medical Times and Gazette* for April 3, 1852, p. 341.

² Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal for 1843.

³ Medical Gazette for January 3, 1851.

hospitals with which they are wished to be compared; and there were various other powerful conditions present, calculated to diminish the apparent amount of deaths, and increase the apparent amount of recoveries, among his patients.

It was at one time my intention to take up fully here the comparison of the hospital statistics of ordinary and of homœopathic hospitals, with the view of pointing out at length those attendant differences and conditions in these two classes of institutions, and of showing the utter frailty and fallaciousness of the statistical proofs and comparisons, which modern homœopathists have so fondly and frequently paraded before the profession and the public as “infallible evidence” of the truth of their system. But since the second edition of the present pamphlet appeared, this part of the subject has been so admirably treated by Dr Routh, in an Essay which he has published, “On the Fallacies of Homœopathy, and the imperfect Statistical Inquiries on which the results of that Practice are estimated,” that I feel it to be now altogether unnecessary for me to dwell at any length upon a topic which Dr Routh has discussed with much more ability than I could hope to do. Dr Gairdner, also, has more lately published in the *Medical Times* (April 3), a short but excellent paper on “Homœopathic Hospital Statistics.” In the remainder of the present chapter, I only propose, therefore, to offer a very few abridged observations on the same subject, merely as a sample of the glaring faults and fallacies which homœopathists have committed in their supposed statistical proof of their system of cure. In doing so, I shall freely avail myself of Dr Routh’s and Dr Gairdner’s remarks, and of other data; while, at the same time, I beg to refer any readers who are desirous of studying a more complete inquiry into all the branches of this part of our subject to Dr Routh’s able Essay.

Dr Routh has shown, in the most full and complete manner, that the *apparent* small amount of mortality in Fleischmann’s and the two or three other homœopathic hospitals of which we have any report, as compared with the larger per-centage of mortality seen in the published reports of the ordinary hospitals of this and other countries, is owing to a series of circumstances connected in no way with the *method of treatment* respectively adopted in these institutions. The general hospitals in this and other countries have been usually established purely on benevolent grounds, and for the sole object of curing the diseased when a cure was possible, or of tem-

porarily alleviating and retarding their maladies when a cure was beyond the power of art. Most of these hospitals, like our own Infirmary at Edinburgh, have their doors open for all applicants,—the only qualifications required, on the part of those that seek admission, being the co-existence of a sufficient degree of poverty in the applicants, with a sufficient degree of severity in the diseases they suffer under; and always, in these institutions (unless, which is rare, the hospital be so very large and extensive as to admit *all* those who seek its services and aid), the slighter forms and cases of disease are rejected and excluded, in order that the beds may be occupied with cases of greater urgency, and consequently of greater danger. Dr Fleischmann's Hospital, however, and most, if not all, other homœopathic hospitals hitherto instituted, have been established, on the other hand, with the special view, among others, of instituting a supposititious and favourable comparison between the results of homœopathic and of ordinary practice. Indeed, the very persistence of the government grant for the maintenance of Dr Fleischmann's Hospital, was understood to depend upon his returning a sufficiently small amount of mortality among his patients;¹ and no unprejudiced inquirer who will look calmly into the subject, can have any doubts that Fleischmann's patients have been selected, and his returns made up, with a view of securing sufficiently satisfactory results for the government, and for the patrons of homœopathy.

In order to make their returns as seemingly favourable as possible to the influence of infinitesimal doses, a variety of circumstances have been taken advantage of by the physicians of homœopathic hospitals, as pointed out by Dr Routh. Let us glance at some of the principal among these circumstances.

I. They exclude *moribund* cases from their returns of cases admitted. This exclusion makes of itself alone a difference occasionally of from 2 to 4 per cent. in the mortality returns. These moribund cases are "admitted (says Dr Routh) in our allopathic returns, even though a patient be admitted but one hour before death."

II. The *grade of patients* admitted varies the rate of mortality in an hospital; and Fleischmann's institution affords him a great advan-

¹ Dr Routh's pamphlet on Homœopathy, p. 40.

tage in this respect. In six out of ten of the London workhouses, where the inmates are of the very poorest and lowest class of society, the mortality among *both* the sick and healthy was, according to the official report of the Registrar-General, upwards of 20 per cent.; while among the sick alone, in eight out of ten of the general hospitals of London, and where the inmates were of a better class, the mortality did not amount to 9 per cent. "I can state (says Dr Routh, p. 43), from personal observation, in regard to Fleischmann's Hospital, that the patients are not the very poorest, but the better class of working mechanics and manufacturers. Those (he adds) in the general allopathic hospital are oftentimes the most wretched objects living."¹

III. The degree of *comfort* and proper *nursing* of hospital patients, the quietude and perfectness of ventilation of an hospital, has no small influence upon the well-being and recovery of its sick inmates. In these respects, Fleischmann's Hospital, and others, are confessedly superior.²

¹ "And here it is important to notice, that the delusion of homœopathy has only reached the upper and better class, and not the very lower orders. These, debilitated oftentimes by excess, privation, exposure, etc., are at all times the more obnoxious to disease, and less able to resist it when once it has attacked them. The acute cases, in addition, will be sure to come to us,—at least the great majority of such cases. The purely nervous or the chronic—the ailing, proverbially known to last the longer—will have no objection to try homœopathy; *à priori*, therefore, here is a source whereby mortality might be considerably reduced."—*Routh's Fallacies of Homœopathy*, p. 43.

² "Taking Fleischmann's Hospital as my example, I can safely assert, I never saw one in which the internal arrangements, attention, and kindness of attendants were more excellently exemplified. With Dr Balfour, I must say that the Austrians, as a rule, and especially the working classes, are eminently a people easily influenced by superstition. The Sisters of Charity, on the other hand, who undertake the nursing of the patients in this hospital, are also their spiritual advisers, and are very superior to those whom we are accustomed to see in Paris and elsewhere. Those who have witnessed the severity of the former, are most agreeably surprised on observing the humility, gentleness, unremitting kindness, of the Sisters of Charity in Vienna. The calm aspect of religion they betray, the beauty frequently observed in their persons, act, as it were, like charms to soothe the pangs of the body; while their melodious accents, often raised in the language of prayer, instil peace into the minds of the sick. This statement will be the more readily believed as emanating from a Protestant; and, if it be correct, must be considered as exerting a very powerful influence on the course of diseases."—*Routh's Fallacies of Homœopathy*, p. 43.

"The superiority," observes Dr Balfour, "of attendance, is also one great advantage in favour of this hospital (Fleischmann's), independently of the important fact,

IV. The *age* of the patients admitted into an hospital has great influence over its mortality returns. Disease becomes more and more fatal in its attacks after the age of puberty; the danger to life increasing, as Mr Edmonds has proved, in a regular geometrical progression, and the rate of increase or danger of death from any individual disease,—as fever, cholera, pneumonia, etc.,—and from all diseases, taken collectively, rising very nearly 34 per cent. every ten years. In infancy and childhood disease is specially fatal. It is least fatal from the age of 10 to 40; and if the patients admitted into an hospital be principally of this last middle period of life, the cypher of mortality would in consequence be very markedly less than if aged patients were admitted in the proportion in which they exist in general society. The number of persons in the general community living above 40 years of age, is known to be about 22 per cent.; and the number living between the ages of 10 and 40 is about 52 per cent. But the three homœopathic hospitals of Vienna, Leipsic, and Leuze, have a proportion of aged patients not amounting, as it should do, to 22 per cent., but only amounting to about 15 per cent.; while of patients at the most favourable age of recovery from attacks of disease, viz., from 10 to 40, they admit,—as their own returns unwittingly prove,—a third too many, viz., 73 per cent., instead of 52 per cent.,—showing, as various other facts show, a careful and cautious principle of selection of the patients admitted; and such a selection in this as in other matters, as is calculated to give an appearance of success in their ultimate mortality returns.

V. Of all the circumstances, however, which affect the comparative amount of mortality in the comparative returns of different hospitals, confessedly the most important is the *relative severity, curability, and fatality* of the classes of diseases admitted into their wards. An hospital, for example, admitting solely patients affected with consumption, or patients affected with fever, necessarily pre-

that the nurses are spiritual as well as temporal comforters." "It may not be inappropriate," he continues, "to state here also—more particularly as I shall have occasion to compare the results of the homœopathic treatment with those observed in an ordinary hospital,—that in Dr Fleischmann's institution the pneumonic patients are *not* auscultated and percussed, and unceremoniously lectured over several times a-day, as is the case in the General Hospital. This difference will not appear a matter of indifference to any one who has witnessed the proceedings in the two instances."—*British and Foreign Medical Review*, vol. xxii. p. 571.

sents an immensely higher mortality than an hospital admitting solely patients suffering under catarrhs, dyspepsias, or other forms of non-organic derangement. In the preceding paragraphs, we have glanced at various circumstances of selection and position influencing greatly and favourably the published homœopathic hospital returns. Let us dwell, however, at a little greater length on this last point, as affecting these returns,—viz., the comparative curability and fatality of the classes of ailments admitted into homœopathic and allopathic hospitals. And with this object, let us make a comparison between the relative severity of the cases and the kind of patients admitted into Fleischmann's Hospital, and into any of the large "Allopathic Hospitals" in this country; and we shall see on this point alone, far more than sufficient and ample reasons, for any difference that may exist as to the actual mortality in the two classes of institutions. For this purpose, let us, as suggested by Dr Gairdner, take for the purpose of comparison, the statistical reports of the Edinburgh Infirmary, and those of Fleischmann's Hospital at Vienna, published in English by Drs Russell and Drysdale. The Edinburgh Infirmary reports were published annually for some years, with great care, by Drs Reid, Bennett, and Peacock. Dr Peacock's two reports of the Edinburgh Hospital are specially elaborate; embrace two of the same years as Fleischmann's (1842-43); and contain a return of nearly the same number of patients,—Fleischmann's report being that of 6501 cases treated in his Homœopathic Hospital, and Dr Peacock's report being that of 6369 patients treated in the Edinburgh Infirmary, with 758 deaths, or a mortality amounting to 12 per cent. Why is the mortality in this and other large "allopathic hospitals" greater than in Dr Fleischmann's Homœopathic Hospital? Some of the preceding observations afford in part a reply to this interrogatory. The two following considerations are of still more importance as necessary parts of the answer to such an inquiry:—

First,—"The mortality of an hospital does not (as Mr Thomson correctly states) depend upon the treatment so much as on the *nature of the cases admitted*."¹ The mortality in the Edinburgh and in other similar metropolitan hospitals is always greatly increased by the numbers of *very fatal* or altogether *incurable* diseases which they find it their duty to admit; while in a small hospital, such as Fleischmann's,

¹ Medical and Surgical Journal, No. 158.

where the admissions, selections, and dismissions of patients, are entirely and solely under his own control and direction, the corresponding general mortality may be, and, as we can prove, is, immensely diminished by admitting comparatively few or no examples of these necessarily very fatal or incurable maladies. In a pamphlet published at Leipsic in 1831, and entitled, "A Word of Warning to all Sick Persons," Hahnemann ascribes "hundreds and thousands" of deaths every year from "consumption and suppuration of the lungs," to the results of allopathic treatment. But though the production and fatality of Consumption were thus, in the ungenerous and charlatanish language of Hahnemann, ascribed to the old school of physis, his homœopathic followers have usually, as far as possible, warily avoided any attempt to cure such cases, or have taken care at least not to damage their statistics by admitting too many cases of this malady into their hospitals.¹ Thus, while among the 6369 Edinburgh Hospital cases, 276 were patients labouring under consumption, only 98 consumptive cases occur among the 6501 individuals admitted into Fleischmann's Homœopathic Hospital.—The same fact holds true of other similar diseases. Thus, out of the respective 6000 and odd patients admitted into the General Hospital of Edinburgh and the Homœopathic Hospital of Vienna, there were of palsies, 103 cases at Edinburgh, 5 only at Vienna; of organic disease of the heart, 159 cases at Edinburgh, 15 only at Vienna; of organic disease of the liver, 33 cases at Edinburgh, 1 only at Vienna; of Bright's disease of the kidney, 82 at Edinburgh, none at Vienna; of diabetes mellitus, 17 cases at Edinburgh, none at

¹ We see enough, and far more than enough, in this chapter, to doubt the accuracy of Fleischmann's "great results." But if Fleischmann is inaccurate, it is only by comparison; for other homœopathic returns are not even so honest as his. For example, in regard to pulmonary consumption or phthisis, Fleischmann has publicly declared that he does not believe that homœopathy has any drug or drugs which can cure this disease, or even perhaps succeed in retarding its progress. (*Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. ii. p. 31.) Yet the Munich homœopathic returns report *thirteen* cases of consumption "cured," out of nineteen treated. (*Ibid*, vol. v. p. 110.) And Mr Sampson, in a work on homœopathy, published a few years ago "under the superintendence of the English Homœopathic Society," reports 75 "cures" of phthisis among the out-patients of the London Homœopathic Institution! (*Concise Views of Homœopathy*, p. 71.) In speaking of these statistics of Mr Sampson, the Editors of the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, protest that such an "attempt to prove too much is injurious to any cause, however just and righteous." And, I opine, the same remark might be quite truly applied by the same Editors to all the homœopathic statistics hitherto published. See an instance of their own tendencies in this line, in our foot note, p. 107.

Vienna; of internal aneurisms, 18 cases at Edinburgh, 1 at Vienna; of caries and necrosis, 57 cases at Edinburgh, 5 at Vienna; of malignant (cancerous) tumours, 55 cases at Edinburgh,¹ none at Vienna; of other tumours, 36 cases at Edinburgh, none at Vienna; and so on.

Though we may well doubt the honesty, we cannot doubt the prudence, of Fleischmann excluding, as far as possible, from his hospital-beds instances of these more fatal and formidable human maladies. Their rejection, however, or admission, necessarily makes an enormous difference in any hospital returns. When cases which are "incurable, or which lead naturally to a fatal termination, are admitted into an hospital in considerable numbers," the general or average mortality returns of that hospital are, as shown by Mr Thomson in the paper referred to, increased and heightened in a proportional degree. To show this fact in relation to various hospitals, and the importance of the fact as itself altering immensely the mortality cypher, or amount of the deaths from different institutions, Mr Thomson takes from various official reports the number of admissions and deaths of cases of *five* forms of disease, viz.,—(1) pulmonary consumption or phthisis; (2) organic disease of the heart; (3) aneurism of the large vessels; (4) organic disease of the kidneys; and (5) organic diseases of the stomach; and he proves the differences in the general mortality of different hospitals to be *swayed, in a great measure*, by the proportion of patients affected with *these* five diseases or classes of disease. Let us apply the same test to our comparison between the nature and severity of the 6000 and odd cases respectively admitted into the Edinburgh Hospital and the Vienna Homœopathic Hospital.

Of these five diseases, 120 cases were admitted by Fleischmann among his 6524 patients; or, in other words, such maladies were admitted into his hospital in the proportion of $1\frac{8}{10}$ per cent. Of the same five diseases, 548 cases were admitted into the Edinburgh

¹ Mr Sampson in his "*Concise View of Homœopathy*," reports under the strange amalgamation of "cutaneous diseases, schirrous, and cancerous affections," 179 cases treated at the Homœopathic Institution, London. Of these 179 "cutaneous, schirrous, and cancerous affections," 90 (he states) were "cured," and 1 died! In reviewing his work, the Editors of the *Journal of Homœopathy* observe, "Mr Sampson is evidently a man of great abilities, his style is clear, and his zeal great;" far too great, we fear, to allow any degree of belief whatever to be attached to his statements and evidence, by any man who has the slightest knowledge of medical science or of medical statistics.

Infirmary among 6369 patients; or in other words, such maladies were admitted into the Infirmary in the proportion of 10 per cent. In the Vienna Hospital, 1 in every 54 patients was at the time of admission the subject of one or other of these five dangerous and incurable affections; on the other hand, in the Edinburgh Hospital, 1 in every 10 patients was, at the time of admission, the subject of one or other of these hopeless maladies. Again, in the Edinburgh Hospital, as in other large general hospitals, the annual mortality is more or less increased by the admission of cases of external injury, and by the deaths that so often ensue in these cases. Among the 6000 cases admitted into Fleischmann's Hospital, I find only 52 cases of external injury admitted—namely, 34 cases of wounds, evidently all of a slight kind, as all the patients recovered; and 18 cases of burns, of whom 2 died. But, on the contrary, among the corresponding 6000 cases admitted into the Edinburgh Infirmary, there were no less than 641 cases of external injury, and of these 69 died, making as much as about 9 per cent. of all the mortality. Of the 6000 cases in the Edinburgh Infirmary, 150 were the subjects, when in hospital, of some of the “principal operations” in surgery; and of these 32 died. Dr Fleischmann's 6000 cases do not include the results of any surgical operations.

Secondly, while the mortality among the patients in any hospital, and altogether independently of treatment, may be easily diminished by thus *excluding* from its wards the more fatal and incurable types of disease, the same object (of an apparent small mortality among its inmates) may be in any instance further greatly prevented by *only admitting*, on the other hand, into its beds, patients suffering under the milder and slighter forms of disease, such forms as are readily and constantly curable by rest, regimen, diet, and the *vis medicatrix*. The slightest comparison in this respect between the 6000 cases in the Homœopathic Hospital of Vienna and the 6000 cases in the Edinburgh Infirmary, broadly and glaringly shows the immense advantage that Dr Fleischmann has gained for his returns from this circumstance, viz., the mild and non-fatal character of the affections admitted by him.¹ Thus, while among the 6000 Edin-

¹ Speaking of his personal observation of the kind and severity of the cases treated in Dr Fleischmann's Hospital, Dr Routh observes, “I can honestly affirm that the serious cases are few and far between; the milder cases, on the contrary, of frequent occurrence.” “I remember (says he) having once seen a young lad admitted into Fleischmann's Hospital for simple headache. On the visit the next day he was well, and yet had not seen any physician or been prescribed for. Yet, on his visit, the

burgh Hospital cases, we have 34 cases of that non-fatal disease,—inflamed sore throat, or *cynanche tonsillaris*; among the 6000 Vienna Homœopathic cases there are no less than 301 cases of this affection. In the Edinburgh returns there are 2 cases, and in the Vienna returns 110 cases, of chicken-pox; in Edinburgh, 1 case of herpes or tetter, in Vienna 20 cases; 48 cases of chlorosis and amenorrhœa at Edinburgh, and 90 at Vienna; 37 cases of headache at Edinburgh, 61 at Vienna; 52 cases of influenza at Vienna, none in the Edinburgh returns; and so on. “There are”—(says Dr Balfour, when speaking of the class of patients whom he saw and watched in Fleischmann’s Hospital)—“there are, I may say, hundreds of trifling cases admitted here, which would not have been admitted into any hospital in England.”¹

Seeing, then, the mode in which Dr Fleischmann’s data are selected and drawn up,—cases of severe and incurable diseases, and fatal accidents and operations, being excluded from his returns, and a large over-proportion of naturally very mild and curable affections being admitted into his hospital,—no one need wonder at the mortality in his returns being less than the returns of Edinburgh, and other similar hospitals, which admit all classes of cases *except the very mild*, and which, in fact, are in the habit, whenever there is a choice left, of selecting, on moral and charitable grounds, the more clamant and dangerous cases, in preference to the less severe. Nay, does not the return of 6 per cent. of deaths, in the class of cases admitted and treated by Fleischmann, show the very reverse of success? “I maintain,” observes Dr Gairdner, “without fear of contradiction, that these homœopathic returns are not only without all triumph to the system, but that they cover it with disgrace. With such a selection of cases, they ought to have reduced their mortality to a far lower point than they have done.” And certainly, to say the least, it was most impolitic, on the part of the homœopaths, to parade and proclaim, as they have done, these returns of Fleischmann’s, as “far beyond the reach of any other known method of treatment.” For, in fact, most of the provincial hospitals of Scotland and England, admitting within their walls *all* classes of applicants, and *all* forms of disease and injury, however severe and dangerous, have an average mortality considerably less

physician could not pass him over. A globule was ordered, and no doubt in the annual returns the case was recorded as a cure.”—P. 39.

¹ Medical Review for 1846, vol. xxii. p. 672.

than Fleischmann's. Fleischmann's mortality, with his rejected severe organic diseases, and his selected cases of trivial affections, amounted, as we have seen, to 6·2 per cent. The Dundee Hospital has an average mortality of 5·1 per cent.; that of Aberdeen, 4·6 per cent.; that of Inverness, 4·3 per cent.; and—independently of all rejection and selection of cases and patients—out of thirty provincial hospitals in England, cited by Mr Thomson, the average mortality of the whole is 4·4 per cent., or less than that of Fleischmann by nearly one-third. The official reports of our English military hospitals, where there is, of course, no kind of selection amongst the patients, is even less; for it amounts only to about 2 per cent.¹

VI. Lastly, in reference to the comparison of homœopathic with other hospital returns, let us consider another and a very potent source of fallacy, in Dr Fleischmann's reports. An error in the *nomenclature* of the diseases returned in an hospital report, may give a very false appearance of success in the treatment of particular diseases. There can be little, or indeed no doubt, that such errors, in the naming of the diseases of their patients, have been committed by Fleischmann and others, and that they have returned large numbers of particular *severe* diseases, as admitted and cured by them, when there was every reason to believe that they had not under their care the number of these cases which they averred; when the number of such severe diseases returned was out of all proportion with similar and milder diseases, for which, by an error in nomenclature, it was possible to enter them; and when, also, the very small number of these similar milder diseases, that were returned, proved that they (the milder) had been entered under the head of some more serious disease,—a fact that only becomes a greater source of fallacy in Fleischmann's reports, when actually, as we have seen, the proportion of mild cases in his Hospital was specially and peculiarly large.

The remark which I have just made particularly applies to the alleged great number of cases of acute *Inflammation* in the head, chest, and abdomen, seen in the returns of homœopathic as compared with allopathic hospitals. Every physician knows how easily an attack of neuralgic, spasmodic, or rheumatic pain, in any of these parts, may be mistaken for and set down as an attack of inflammation—as simple pleurodynia for actual pleurisy or pneumonia—head-

¹ The mean mortality in our military hospitals "is 2·1 per cent.; the maximum being 2·6, and the minimum 1·1 per cent."—*Medical Review* for 1852, p. 475.

ache and cerebral congestion for inflammation of the brain, or its membranes—colic for enteritis or peritonitis, etc.; or how readily a milder disease may be returned for a more severe—as diarrhœa for dysentery,—cholera for cholera,—spurious or spasmodic croup for true inflammatory croup,—bronchitis for pneumonia, etc. etc.

The disease which I have last named, PNEUMONIA, has, perhaps, of all diseases, “made the most perverts to homœopathy.” The treatments of it, and other inflammations of the chest, are, observes a homœopathic writer (Dr Marsdon), “the very touchstones of medical skill,—the test of medical power.”

No homœopathist can object, therefore, if we select Pneumonia as an illustration of these last remarks, and altogether as an apposite criterion and evidence of the utility or inutility of infinitesimal doses. And I shall, in consequence, in the way of illustration of the above observations, proceed to show,—1st, The errors committed in the homœopathic returns, regarding the nomenclature and actual number of cases of severe diseases, like this of Pneumonia, alleged to be admitted into their hospitals, and entered in their returns; and, 2d, To point out the actual nothingness of homœopathy in relation to its treatment.

Of course, if the infinitesimal globules or tinctures used by homœopathists in cases of Pneumonia count for nothing towards the recovery of their patients, people affected with Pneumonia should recover from this disease in as large numbers, *without* any medicinal treatment, as *with* merely homœopathic treatment. To ascertain and determine if this were the fact or not, we would require to have a means of comparing the results—1st, Of a number of cases of Pneumonia treated by diet and regimen alone, without any medicine, and 2d, Of a number treated by diet and regimen alone, with the *addition* of the supposed appropriate infinitesimal doses. But, in order to make the comparison perfect, the respective cases of Pneumonia, treated with or without homœopathic medicamentation, would require to be cases in the same locality, as the disease differs in its intensity, according to its complications, etc., in different communities. The Pneumonias of the hospital patients of London and Edinburgh are, for example, very often dangerously complicated with the co-existence of Bright’s disease of the kidney, while those of Vienna are, it is said, rarely so;¹ and such a difference would make the English disease a

¹ See Dr Routh’s pamphlet, p. 19, for its rarity at Vienna.

far more severe and fatal malady than the Austrian. The cases compared should also be reported with equal fidelity, as regards the favourable or the fatal results. And, lastly, it would be necessary to fix the fact that the *name* Pneumonia should be applied always to the same affection ; and cases of bronchitis, and other diseases, more or less *resembling* Pneumonia, should not be returned as cases of Pneumonia.¹

We have to some extent the means of making such a comparison by contrasting the hospital returns of Dietl at Vienna, who lately treated 189 cases of pneumonia by diet and regimen alone, with the hospital returns of Fleischmann in the same population, who treated his cases of pneumonia by diet and regimen, and the *addition* of infinitesimal doses. So far the comparison holds good. And let us make it, though we have, as I shall show immediately, good reason for believing that in relation to some of the requisite conditions, Fleischmann's cases are egregiously in fault ; that he entered cases of bronchitis as cases of pneumonia ; and, what is still more reprehensible, that he did not return all the deaths that occurred among his pneumonia patients as deaths from that disease.

In his official reports Fleischmann states that he has treated 538 cases of pneumonia in his Homœopathic Hospital ; that 508 of these patients were cured and twenty-eight died ; or that the mortality amounted to 1 death in 17 cases, or to 5 per cent. The Homœopathic Hospital returns from Leipsic and Kremzier give a higher mortality in pneumonia than these from Vienna, and show a larger mortality, viz., a mortality of 13 per cent. at Leipsic and 15 per cent. at Kremzier, instead of the 5 per cent. of Fleischmann at Vienna. But as I have stated above, let us take Fleischmann's, though the most favourable to homœopathy, because we have from Dietl, Physician to the Wieden Hospital at Vienna, the means of

¹ Most pathologists will also, I believe, grant that it would not be proper to consider the results of pneumonia, etc., as seen under different types at different *times*. Diseased action seems to vary in its character at different periods, following apparently some kind of cyclical course. Inflammatory and other diseases do not require at present the amount of bleedings, leechings, etc., applied to the same affections some thirty or forty years ago. At the present time we rarely see cases of fever, scarlatina, etc., such as were often observed by the physicians of these times, with the temperature of the arm-pits or mouth increased to 104°, 105°, or 106° of Fahrenheit. But possibly and probably, the same diseases will again come betimes to show the same amount of vascular activity, and again demand more depleting measures than are required at present in their treatment.

partially comparing the mortality from pneumonia under homœopathic treatment, with Dietl's mortality from pneumonia under the expectant method, among the same population, viz., that of Vienna.

The following table shows the results in Pneumonia in these two Vienna hospitals, as obtained by Fleischmann when using homœopathic medicines, and by Dietl when using no medicines whatever:—

TABLE OF RESULTS OF PNEUMONIA AT VIENNA.

	No. of Cases.	No. of Deaths.	Proportion of Deaths.	Per Centage of Deaths.
Fleischmann's Hospital, with homœopathic treat- ment.....	538	28	1 in 17	5 in 100
Dietl's Hospital with no medical treatment.....	189	14	1 in 13	7 in 100

In this return it may at first sight, and to those unacquainted with the special circumstances, appear that the advantage is in favour of homœopathic treatment, and that the homœopathic drug diminished the mortality from 7 to 5 per cent. ; or from 1 death in 13 cases—the result when no medicine was given, to 1 death in 17 cases—the result when infinitesimal doses of homœopathic medicine were used.

But unfortunately for the truth of homœopathy and the veracity of homœopathists, sufficient evidence exists to prove,—

1st, That in every human probability the alleged 538 cases of pneumonia returned by Fleischmann were by no means all of them cases of pneumonia, such as we understand that term in common medical language, but that a considerable if not a large proportion of them were instances of the milder inflammatory disease Bronchitis ; and,

2d, Even if it were granted that the total number of the cases of pneumonia reported by Fleischmann were correct, there is sufficient evidence to show that his official return of the number of deaths in these cases is incorrect and understated.

The proof of Fleischmann's alleged cases of pneumonia being not all cases of genuine pneumonia amounts to this : Pneumonia (or inflammation of the *substance* and minute cells of the lungs) is

often in practice, and particularly if auscultation is not sufficiently attended to, confounded with, and mistaken for, that much milder and more common disease Bronchitis (or inflammation of the *lining membrane* of the bronchial tubes of the lungs). In the general Allopathic Hospital of Vienna the cases of bronchitis admitted average about 7 per cent. of all the diseases; the cases of pneumonia average about 2 per cent. These results give us then the relative average proportion at Vienna of cases of bronchitis and pneumonia requiring or seeking admission into hospital. But in Fleischmann's Homœopathic Hospital at Vienna, the cases of bronchitis reported as admitted, are not 7 in the 100, for they do not reach 1 per cent.; while the cases of Pneumonia reported as admitted, instead of being 2 per cent. of the whole, are returned as $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole.¹ "The review (says Dr Routh) of these facts admits but one of two inferences,—the cases are either picked out or selected, or the diagnosis is wrong,"—cases of the milder disease, bronchitis, being officially returned as cases of the more severe and dangerous disease Pneumonia.

But, secondly, even supposing, for the sake of argument, that Fleischmann had not fallen into the error, which his statistics indicate, of entering cases of the milder disease, bronchitis, for cases of the severer disease, Pneumonia, and that his nomenclature and diagnosis of his 538 cases were correct,—still we know that his statistical statements of the *results* of his treatment in Pneumonia are not to be depended upon. In evidence of this, we may content ourselves with stating one single uncontradicted fact. The English physician who has hitherto studied longest, I believe, in Fleischmann's Hospital, is Dr Balfour. During the three months of May, June, and July 1846, Dr Balfour diligently and zealously attended Fleischmann's hospital practice; took regular notes of all the more interesting cases; and has published, among others, the histories of nineteen cases of pneumonia which he watched under treatment in the hospital during that time. Of these nineteen cases of pneumonia, three died, or 1 patient in 6; or about 15 per cent. Dr Balfour has published the details of these three fatal cases amongst the others which he has reported. The name of the disease in these three cases was written upon the board at the top of each patient's bed by Fleischmann with his own hand,—a practice he does not

¹ See the full data in Dr Routh's Essay.

follow in all cases, and never till after fully satisfying himself of the nature and character of the disease. Among these nineteen cases, then, of pneumonia, occurring in Fleischmann's hospital practice during the three months, May, June, and July of 1846, *three* died, or 1 in every $6\frac{1}{3}$. But when Fleischmann published his official homœopathic report of the hospital for the whole twelve months of that year (1846), though he returned sixty-four cases of pneumonia as having been under treatment in his wards during these twelve months, he returned the cases of death from this disease as amounting during that time only to *two*. Dr Balfour saw, I repeat, *three* patients die of pneumonia under Fleischmann's care, in May, June, and July 1846; and Fleischmann officially returned and reported only *two* as dying of pneumonia during the whole twelve months of the same year 1846.¹

It would be painful to speak of such a deliberate and glaring statistical mis-statement, were it not in the highest degree probable that this official return is only a specimen of the incorrectness of the whole; and were it not true also, that these disingenuous returns have been often ostentatiously pressed upon the public of this and other countries, as a reason *why* rational men should peril the lives of themselves and others, by trusting, in acute disease, to the inanities and nothingness of homœopathy.² Dr Balfour states his conviction, that

¹ See Monthly Journal of Medical Science for February 1848, p. 624.

² There is a striking and instructive episode connected with the averment made by Fleischmann, that in 1846 he only lost *two* patients in his wards from pneumonia. To save the credit of the alleged success of homœopathy in pneumonia, the Editors of the British Journal of Homœopathy, in reviewing the Vienna cases watched and reported upon by Dr Balfour, and apparently unaware of being preceded in their tactics by Fleischmann himself, attempted to deny that one of the *three* fatal cases seen and recorded by Dr Balfour was a case of pneumonia. The Editors remark,—

“Dr Balfour saw nineteen cases of pneumonia. He observes: ‘These cases of pneumonia give an average of twenty-four, an average treatment of 12·6 days, and a mortality of 15 per cent.; three out of the nineteen having died. Skoda's cases of pneumonia, during the same time, amount to forty-five, his deaths to three; giving an average of 6·6 per cent.’ This comparison, we think, is incorrect, as we cannot consider Case VI. to have been a case of pneumonia at all; which being omitted, there would be eighteen cases, and two deaths; or 11·1 per cent.”—(Vol. v. p. 92.)

Dr Balfour assures me that this case (No. VI. in his report of the cases of pneumonia) was most unmistakeably marked as an instance of that disease; and was, as already stated, written down as such on the patient's board by Fleischmann himself. Dr Balfour's published report explicitly mentions, that the patient had pain in breathing,—rusty blood-stained expectoration,—the percussion on the right side was dull, as high as the centre of the mammary and scapular spaces,—that over these dull spaces the respiration was bronchial, and elsewhere vesicular, etc.; all

the secret of Fleischmann's seeming success, as given in his official reports, lies in the fact of the admission and dismissal of patients from his hospital being entirely uncontrolled; and there being no check on the proper and honest nomenclature even of the diseases of his patients.¹ The very existence, as has been already stated, of Fleischmann's Hospital depended for a time (and perhaps does so still) upon his mortality tables showing an amount of mortality which shall be considered sufficiently favourable by the Austrian Government; and consequently, he is under no ordinary temptation to admit only mild and curable cases; to report as cured, cases which may not be so;² to hasten the demission of the

of them forming amply conclusive evidence that the disease was pneumonia; and he died on the third day after admission. (See *Dr Forbes' Review*, vol. xxii. p. 584; and also vol. xxiii. p. 611.) Is it not truly significant, and in itself, portentously suspicious, to find Dr Fleischmann and his British homœopathic brethren trying,—and both in the same way,—to change the statistics of these pneumonia cases, in order to make them *apparently* conform to the alleged success which homœopaths have had in the treatment of this disease? When we find two writers, independently of each other, thus adopting the same improper tactics, regarding the same cases, does it not show that these tactics are a part of the general system of their medical or statistical creed?

¹ "I feel convinced (says he) that the secret of Dr Fleischmann's great seeming success, lies in the fact of the admissions and demissions being entirely uncontrolled, and there being no check on the diagnosis. Rarely other than well-marked cases have their diagnosis written on the board at their bed-head; the others being left blank, and entered in his book, of course, as he pleases. . . . The whole process of the admission and discharge of patients is mysterious. . . . Many cases, not improving, or apparently not likely to improve, are got rid of very summarily."—(*Medical Review*, vol. xxii. p. 673.)

² The proportion of cures among all the patients and cases admitted into his Homœopathic Hospital, and returned statistically by Fleischmann, affords unwitting and intrinsic evidence of the whole character of his Hospital Reports. "In the record of a death (observes Dr Gairdner) it is impossible to show any bias, or in any way to deviate from accuracy, without gross falsehood, or correspondingly great risk of detection. But in the column of *Cures*, in this hospital, may be read the character of the whole of its records. The alleged cures in the Vienna Homœopathic Hospital are 92 per cent. of the whole cases; and, as the deaths are 6·25 per cent., it follows, that there is actually *scarcely any medium between death and cure!* To any one who knows what hospital cases are, or should be, this simple statement proves rather more than was intended. Compare it with the returns of any hospital which has no system to support,—I choose Dumfries, simply because its mortality is identical with that of Fleischmann's Hospital:—

	Cures, per cent.	Deaths, per cent.
"Fleischmann's Hospital.....	92'	6'26
Dumfries ,,	76'02.....	6'26

"Alas for the 'vaulting ambition that o'erleaps itself,' and falls on the other side of

more acute cases;¹ and, for the sake and spread of homœopathy, to magnify the success of his results in the treatment of that favourite acute disease of the homœopathists — Pneumonia.²

truth and probability! In straining every nerve after this ideal and fictitious ratio of cures, Dr Fleischmann unluckily forgot the following ugly dilemma: If, from the excellence of his art, or any other cause, he was enabled to cure 16 per cent. more than Dumfries, why was his skill not equally effective in reducing the mortality? There can be only two answers to this question, and we may give the homœopathists their choice of them. Either the cases were really curable in enormous proportion, and the homœopathic art is responsible for a mortality which must be considered, under these circumstances, quite appalling; or the alleged cures are a mockery and a delusion, inconsistent with nature and fact, and cunningly dressed up for the indiscriminating wonder of the multitude.”—(*Medical Times and Gazette for April 3*, p. 343.)

¹ “Of comparatively trifling cases, many (observes Dr Balfour) remain for weeks, nay, months, in (Fleischmann’s) Hospital; while more acute or more interesting cases are hurried out too often with the cure incomplete. . . . Some of the following cases will be found to have been discharged too early, to enable us to be positive as to the ultimate result. . . . I have seen one patient refused admittance, and that, too, the very day after his discharge, without any very good obvious reason. It was a boy, with effusion into the right pleura, following scarlatina, which he had gone through at home. There was also a general anasarca state of the body, which speedily disappeared, but the chief complaint remained obstinate; and, after thirty-three days’ treatment with bryania, the 2d dilution, four times daily, he was dismissed but slightly improved. This boy was denied admission, when he applied the following day on account of return of pain in the chest,—not certainly for want of room, as his bed was empty for days afterwards. This is not the only effusion into the chest which has been dismissed unimproved during the period of my observations; yet this scarcely agrees with Fleischmann’s returns, as, out of twelve with exudation in the pleura, occurring during ten years, he has, he says, *cured* all but three, who died. And a physician of the General (Allopathic) Hospital has assured me, that many such cases, dismissed by Dr Fleischmann, and subsequently refused admission, have applied to him for relief.”—(*Dr Balfour’s Report on Homœopathic Treatment in Dr Fleischmann’s Hospital, Vienna. Medical Review*, vol. xxii. p. 572.)

² As showing what may readily be effected in the way of obtaining apparently successful statistical results in the treatment of pneumonia, by a selection of particular series of limited cases, Dr Routh cites the following fortunate results in the practice of different observers:—“In 1824, Laennec did not lose one pneumonia case. In 1825, out of 28 pneumonia cases, simple or double, with or without pleurisy, one only died, and this an old man of seventy. In 1825, out of 34 cases, 3 died; two females brought *in articulo mortis*, and an old man above seventy. Altogether, Laennec concludes, that out of 57 pneumonias, he in reality lost but two patients above seventy. Louis lost, out of 20 cases, 3 patients, all from sixty to seventy. In 1831-2, Trousseau lost 2 patients out of 58. None of these were bled in the hospital, but five had been so before admission. Since that period, owing to a change of type, he had not been so successful. Professor Bang, out of 54 cases of pneumonia treated at Copenhagen, lost only 2. These were generally bled at the outset. Dr Wolf did

These statements are, I believe, sufficient to show to any unprejudiced mind, that little, or indeed no dependence, can be placed upon statistics like Fleischmann's; and, at the same time, they prove how truly negative and inefficacious homœopathic practice actually is, even in the treatment of that acute disease where homœopathists boast most of their success, viz. in Pneumonia. Passing, however, from these considerations regarding the question of the effect—or rather, total want of effect—of homœopathy in the treatment of pneumonia, let me proceed very briefly to adduce a few additional remarks and facts, in evidence of the beneficial agency of proper and early ordinary (allopathic) medical treatment, in modifying (1) the severity of the symptoms, (2) the length of the attacks, and (3) the actual fatality of this same disease—pneumonia.

These observations may be stated as follows:—

First, The principal *symptoms* of pneumonia yield earlier, or are shorter in their duration, in cases submitted to venesection and appropriate treatment, than in cases left to nature alone, or merely “expectant treatment.” Thus Dr Forbes (vol. xiii. p. 403) has shown, in his review of Grisolle's work on Pneumonia, that in comparing together cases of the disease treated on the expectant or non-medicinal plan, and similar cases treated by bleeding, etc.,—the following were the results:—

1. The *characteristic expectoration* of pneumonia ceased before the end of the sixth day, or about forty-eight hours after venesection, in the thirteen cases treated by bleeding, etc.; while it continued to the ninth day in the eleven cases which were treated on the expectant method.

2. The *attendant pain in the side* was invariably relieved by bleeding, and disappeared, on the average, on the eighth day, in those treated by the usual antiphlogistic means; whilst, on the average, the same symptom did not disappear till the fifteenth day, in cases which he treated on the expectant method.

not lose any out of 10 cases (Grisolle). Out of 75 cases treated by Bouillaud, recovery was observed as follows: 55 cases of single pneumonia, 2 died; 16 cases of double, 11 died. Mr Husson, out of 43 cases, bled each patient from 1 to 11 times, lost only 3 cases. Grisolle collected 44, for the most part severe,—in 2 cases the pneumonia was double; 6 only died. The fatal cases occurred among weakened individuals, who were generally above fifty years old. Were I to imitate in this compilation the homœopaths, I could conclude I had collected some 300 cases, with a mortality of about 3 per cent.”—(*Routh's Fallacies*, p. 58.)

3. The *accompanying fever* ceased on the seventh day in the cases treated by bleeding, etc.; while it did not cease till the tenth in those treated on the expectant method.

4. The *auscultatory phenomena began to decrease* from the cessation of the fever on the seventh day, in those treated by bleeding, etc.; while they did not begin to decrease till about the end of the second week in those treated on the expectant method.

Secondly, Inflammation of the lungs or pneumonia is shorter in its *duration* in proportion as the disease is submitted earlier to proper medical treatment.

In Grisolles's cases, convalescence commenced on the 7th or 8th day when the disease was treated antiphlogistically, and according to the usual method; convalescence did not commence till the 11th or 12th day in the cases treated by him on the "expectant" method. On an average the affected lung was completely permeable (as ascertained by the stethoscope) on the 12th day in the cases treated by bleeding and the ordinary medicines; whilst the affected lungs were still more or less impermeable up to the 22d or 30th day in the patients treated on the expectant method.

M. Tessier, a homœopathist, has published an account of forty-one cases of pneumonia treated by him in hospital. Of these forty-one cases, three died, or 1 in 13, or about 7 per cent.; other three, however, died of phthisis and erysipelas before they left the hospital.¹ But "these three (observes Dr Routh), would have been returned as fatal cases in an allopathic hospital." Six of the cases had been treated by the usual antiphlogistic or allopathic means, bleeding, etc., etc., *before* they were admitted under M. Tessier's hospital care. The results of the difference between the cases treated thus, also allopathically, and those treated exclusively homœopathically, were as follows:—In the first class (with allopathic treatment before admission), convalescence on an average was established on the *tenth* day after admission, and the total average residence of each patient

¹ If we exclude the cases treated allopathically, and confine the enumeration strictly to those cases of pneumonia treated homœopathically by Tessier, and *their* results, then (says Dr Routh), "the forty-one cases with three deaths, should in reality be considered as thirty-five cases with five deaths, a mortality of 1 in 7, or 14·2 per cent." Besides, it appears from M. Tessier's return that in these pneumonia cases, the proportion of complicated and secondary to uncomplicated and idiopathic cases of the disease was in his wards only 17 per cent., instead of being 50 per cent. as is the usual average in allopathic hospitals.

in hospital was *seventeen* days. In the second class (with exclusive homœopathic treatment), convalescence on an average was established on the *fourteenth* day after admission, and the average residence of each patient in hospital was *twenty-nine* days. The difference was still more striking when the patient was treated allopathically only in the disease, and sent into the hospital in the first stage of the pneumonia. For in those treated allopathically and afterwards admitted when still in the first stage of the inflammation, convalescence on an average was established on the *ninth* day; and the total average residence of each such patient in the hospital was thirteen days; while of those admitted into hospital in the first stage of the inflammation, and who were thus treated exclusively homœopathically, convalescence on an average was not established till the *twentieth* day, and the total average duration of each such patient in hospital was thirty-two days.

Thirdly, The beneficial effects of appropriate medical treatment in pneumonia may be still further proved, by looking to the influence which it exerts over the *mortality* attendant upon the disease, and the way in which this influence is modified, according as the disease is submitted earlier or later in its progress to the treatment in question.

The mortality attendant upon pneumonia becomes less and less in proportion as the disease is submitted earlier and earlier to proper medical treatment. In Grisolle's hospital cases, the mortality was as high as 1 in 3 when the patient had been ill seven days or more before admission to the hospital. But it was reduced so, that—

It was	1 in	4	when the patient had been ill	6	days before admission.
It was	1 in	6	5 days before admission.
It was	1 in	8	4 days before admission.
It was	1 in	13	3 days before admission.

The mortality was diminished in proportion to the previous date and duration of the disease at which the patients came under medical treatment; it was increased in proportion as the patients were more and more slow in being subjected to the appropriate remedial means; the mortality attendant upon pneumonia becoming comparatively small when the disease is both early and properly treated. Inflammation of the lungs occurs often among our soldiers and sailors; and when it does so, the invalid is not only in general early sub-

mitted to appropriate medical treatment, but the sex and age of the patient are favourable for recovery, and the whole success of the treatment is sufficiently striking. We have the results of the "allopathic" treatment of pneumonia in these two services published in the official reports of the British Government, the accuracy of which is beyond any possibility of doubt.

The official Army returns show 12,271 cases of pneumonia among the British troops stationed at Gibraltar, Malta, Ionian Islands, Bermudas, Canada, Cape, Mauritius, and St Helena. Out of these 12,271 patients attacked with inflammation of the lungs, 413 died; or, in other words, 1 in every 29 cases of the disease was fatal; or about 3 in every 100. Out of above 2000 cases of pneumonia at Gibraltar, only 1 in 45 proved fatal; or about 2 in every 100 attacked with this disease.

The official Navy returns show 3,099 cases of pneumonia among the sailors in our fleets when stationed at the Cape, in South America, the Mediterranean, etc. Out of these 3,099 patients attacked with inflammation of the lungs, 136 died; or, in other words, 1 in every 23 cases of the disease was fatal; or about 4 in every 100. Out of 295 cases of pneumonia in the ships placed on the South American stations, only 1 in 59 died; or less than 2 in every 100 attacked with this disease died.

Before passing from the consideration of the preceding instance of acute disease—pneumonia—let me adduce it as an example contradicting in the most explicit manner one of Hahnemann's characteristic broad asseverations and tenets.

We have seen that in the Wieden Hospital at Vienna, under Dietl, cases of pneumonia recovered—all circumstances considered—in as great proportion at least under no medical treatment whatever, as they did in Fleischmann's Hospital of the Sisters of Charity at Vienna under homœopathic treatment.

But in his *Organon* Hahnemann denounced the spontaneous recovery of patients under acute diseases as impossible, or next to impossible. "If to the organism alone (he observes) is left the task of overcoming, by its own forces and without external aid, a disease newly contracted, we then witness nought but painful, often dangerous, efforts of Nature, to save the individual at whatever cost, which often terminate in extinction of the earthly existence, in death"—(p. 27.) "Crude, instinctive Nature is (he main-

tains) in *her* efforts barely successful even in the slighter cases of acute disease;" and he likens the effects of "the unreasoning life-preserving power, when left to itself in diseases," to the practices of the legitimate school of physic. "These self-aiding operations (he remarks, p. 28) of the vital force for the removal of an acute disease, performed *only* in obedience to the laws of organic life, and not guided by the reflexion of an intellect, are at the most but a *species of allopathy*;" for "Nature requires the aid of homœopathy to perform a safe cure"—(p. 65.) It is needless to say how truthless these observations are; but at the same time it is sufficiently amusing to mark the reckless and unscrupulous abuse with which Hahnemann here and elsewhere publicly declaims to his patients and pupils against the conservative, "unreasoning," efforts of Nature, and the self-aiding allopathy-like operations of the *vis medicatrix* (his own important and indispensable ally) in cases of disease. We have already seen (p. 17) how different his private opinion was; but to confess that opinion publicly would have exploded and destroyed in a great measure the whole statistical "experience" and evidence in favour of homœopathy.

In addition, I may here observe, that Hahnemann further professes in his *Organon*, to entertain the same poor opinion of the sanative effects of Nature in the cure also of chronic affections. "Everything (he states), that crude Nature does to relieve itself in diseases, in those of an acute, but especially those of a chronic kind, is extremely imperfect, and even actual disease"—(p. 39). He alleged, as we have already stated (p. 24), that a large proportion—about seven out of every eight—of all chronic diseases was the effect of itch; and asserted that before his discovery of the itch-origin of chronic diseases, and their cure by internal doses of sulphur and other itch-remedies, "the treatment of chronic diseases was INVARIABLY unsuccessful."¹ It is surely superfluous to prove statistically, either that Nature herself does often, very often, cure chronic ailments without the aid of drugs; or that ordinary medical treatment has, all along, cured, and continues to cure, cases of chronic diseases without any aid from itch-remedies. Nay, that such is the fact, we have the experience of Hahnemann, *quantum valeat*, to adduce against the authority of Hahnemann. He discovered the almost universal itch-origin and itch-cure of chronic diseases long after dis-

¹ British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. vii. p. 355.

covering homœopathy. The germs of his strange itch-doctrine were published by him in 1816; and in later life he avowed the opinion, that “the treatment of chronic diseases was invariably unsuccessful,” before his great itch-pathology came to regulate practice. But, “he himself asserted, so early as 1797, that *he* had cured the most severe chronic diseases.”¹ He accomplished, then, in 1797, what latterly he declared to be impossible to accomplish—a sad satire upon homœopathic statistics and statements, by the founder himself of homœopathy. Among the “innumerable” chronic diseases produced by itch, he himself enumerates (see the list previously at p. 24), “scoliosis and cyphosis, caries, cancer, fungus hæmatodes, malignant organic growths,” “cataract, amaurosis, urinary calculus,” etc., etc. And speaking of the treatment of the great class of chronic diseases thus arising from itch by proper itch-remedies, he declares that with this itch-doctrine and these itch-remedies, “the true physician” is now enabled “almost *invariably* to effect CURES” in these maladies, seeing that itch is “the only real, fundamental cause and producer” of these affections.—(*Organon*, p. 183, 184). But certainly never did infinitesimal doses of sulphur nor of any other itch-remedy produce a single cure in any one case of any of the affections just enumerated. The assertion is merely the kind of unscrupulous and unprincipled asseveration which has ever in medical history been the distinctive sign of medical charlatanism.²

¹ British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. vii. p. 355.

² When speaking statistically of homœopathy, let me add one observation here in relation to insanity. Itch, as I have already had occasion to state at p. 28, is now acknowledged by pathologists to be an eruption produced by the presence and burrowing of an insect in the skin—the *Acarus Scabiei*. By using local applications to the skin to poison or kill the insect, the disease or itch is immediately removed. But, in Hahnemann’s opinion, the itch-disease, or itch-miasm (as he expresses it), often on such occasions passes internally, producing a vast host of chronic maladies in the interior of the body of man. Nay, more, according to Hahnemann this insect-disease, or miasm, may go inwards, and even affect the MIND of man. Insanity “almost always (avers Hahnemann) arises from internal psora,” or itch (*Organon*, p. 270); and should be “cured by homœopathic anti-psoric (or itch) medicine, along with scrupulously suitable regimen,” etc. (p. 274). And speaking of the treatment of cases of insanity in lunatic asylums, he states in italics, “*Not one of them is ever really and permanently cured in them*,—a convincing proof (he adds), among others, of the complete nullity of the non-healing art hitherto practised,” (*Organon*, p. 271). The statistical returns of every lunatic asylum can roundly belie this characteristic asseveration of Hahnemann. Out of a table of 125,700 cases of insanity treated in fifty-nine public asylums, the lowest proportion of recoveries is stated at 36 per cent. (See table in Dr Forbes’ Review, vol. xxii. p. 360.) In speaking of itch as reaching and affecting

But setting aside all such discussion as that which relates to the effects of treatment either in any single disease (as pneumonia), or in any special classes of diseases (as in the acute or chronic, or in those observed in hospitals), let me, in concluding this chapter, offer a remark upon the general results which an increased and increasing knowledge of medical science, and consequently, the prevention and cure of the diseases of the community at large has, within the last 100 years, effected in diminishing the absolute mortality in England and Wales, and consequently in prolonging the average duration of human life among their inhabitants.

The “unhallowed main business of the old school of medicine,” was, according to Hahnemann, to render incurable or fatal, “the vast majority (99 in every 100) of all diseases,” and according to the same veracious authority, the ordinary modes of medical treatment “shortened the lives of ten times as many human beings as the most destructive wars, and rendered many millions of patients more diseased and wretched than they were originally.”—(*Organon, Preface*, p. x.)

The gradual diminution, however, which has taken place in the mortality of England as a whole, and in its different parts and cities, shows that medical police and medical practice have, during the course of the last, and earlier part of the present century (when “the old school of physic” had sole charge of the health of the population) produced the most marked change in the health of the general community, and in the prolongation of human life. Thus (to quote one of the latest writers on the subject)—“in 1780, the rate of mortality for the whole of England and Wales, was 1 in 40—in 1801, 1 in 47;—in 1831 it had diminished to 1 in 58—showing an improvement of 38 per cent. in the short period of half a century. The annual mortality of the county of Middlesex, which, in the beginning of the last century, was estimated at 1 in 25, had fallen to 1 in 35 in 1801, and at present does not exceed 1 in 45. . . . From 1720 to 1750, the mortality of London was estimated at 1 in 20; at present, it has decreased to 1 in 46.”—(See *Dublin Review* for Dec. 1836, p. 97.)

Mr Edmonds, one of the most accurate and distinguished actu-

the human mind, it is needless to do more than again refer to the Rev. Mr Everest's doctrine, that itch is the common cause of unnumbered moral evils that prevail in society,—sin, in short, being apparently, according to his tenets, little else, if indeed anything else, than the *Acarus Scabiei*, or its miasm. (See anteedently, p. 25, etc.)

aries of the present day, has published still more full and precise data regarding the increased saving of human life during the course of the last century, and the commencement of the present, in a class of the community in which we can most decidedly and directly trace the happy results to the march of medical science and to the effects of improved views in medical hygiene and medical practice. The elaborate calculations of Mr Edmonds, to which I allude, refer to the former, as compared with the present mortality of infants and children below five years of age, in the population of London. But, without loading the text with the data themselves,¹ let me here state in a concise tabular form, the general results of the interesting enquiries by which Mr Edmonds has so fully and satisfactorily proved the gradual diminution of the infantile mortality of London during the 100 years from 1730 to 1830 inclusive; or, in other words, by which he has proved the great and striking saving which has gradually been effected in infantile life during these 100 years in the metropolis of England.

IN LONDON.

From 1730 to 1749, out of every 100 children born, 74 died under 5 years.						
... 1750 to 1769, ... 100 ... 63 ... 5 years.						
... 1770 to 1789, ... 100 ... 51 ... 5 years.						
... 1790 to 1810, ... 100 ... 41 ... 5 years.						
... 1810 to 1829, ... 100 ... 31 ... 5 years.						

Here, in one, but that a very numerous class of the population, we have had effected within a single century, an enormous saving of human life,—a saving which has been the means of prolonging the average duration of human life in London, by several years. For while during the 20 years from 1730 to 1750, out of every 100 children born in London only 26 lived till they were five years old,—during the 20 years from 1810 to 1829, out of every 100 children born in the same city, 69 survived the same period of life. But these figures are themselves talking texts that really require no comment; and they show in language which admits of no controversy, the utter groundlessness of the truthless and charlatanish assertions of Hahnemann, that the “unhallowed main business of the old school of medicine” was to render incurable or fatal, “the vast majority (99 in every 100) of all diseases;” doing nothing but “torture (their patients), shorten their lives,” etc., while “in

¹ See the full data in the *Lancet* for January 30th, 1836.

recent times (to quote again his own words), the old-school practitioners have quite surpassed themselves in their cruelty towards their sick fellow-creatures," etc.—(*Organon*, p. 54.)

Thoroughly aware how utterly they have failed by statistical evidence,—by appeals to infallible experience,—and otherwise, in proving any medicinal power in their infinitesimal doses, homœopathists have repeatedly resorted to different forms of *physical* or *visible* evidence, with the fond hope of, in this way, establishing the actual existence of medicine in their globules and tinctures, and the actual operation of these infinitesimal doses upon the human body. This line of argument has been particularly insisted upon within the last few months by the most zealous and distinguished homœopathic physicians of England. Speaking of some late means by which the important kind of evidence in question was supposed to be established, this proof is (says the "father of Homœopathy in England," and the President of the Homœopathic Society) "to us homœopathic practitioners, PRECIOUS BEYOND ALL CALCULATION, as a means of calling attention to, and spreading homœopathy among our allopathic colleagues," etc.¹

Let us, therefore, in the next chapter, proceed to inquire into this new and great evidence, "*precious beyond all calculation*," in favour of homœopathy and its doctrines.

¹ Homœopathic Times for November 1st, 1851.

CHAPTER XIII.

ATTEMPTS TO OBTAIN PHYSICAL PROOFS OF THE ACTUAL EXISTENCE AND ACTIVITY OF THE DRUGS CONTAINED IN THE INFINITESIMAL DOSES. MAGNETOSCOPE—SUPPOSED VISIBLE EVIDENCE FROM IT OF VARIOUS HOMŒOPATHIC TENETS. LATER EXPERIMENTS OF DR MADDEN AND OTHERS.

IN an inaugural address delivered last August to the Edinburgh graduates, Professor Christison, when speaking of homœopathy (as one of the various forms of medical delusion and charlatanry prevailing at the present time), observed, in relation to the infinitesimal doses in which homœopathic physicians exhibited their drugs, that these doses were “so inconceivably minute that no sense, no balance, no microscope, no chemical analysis, no human means whatever, can discover the slightest trace of them in what is administered;—you never can have any surety of their presence, or any well-grounded assurance of their absence;—they defy the finite faculties of man to form even a distant conception of them, either with the aid of figures and the eye, or with the help of a vivid imagination.”—(See *Address in Monthly Journal of Medical Science* for September 1851, p. 296.)

With the view of cancelling and answering the preceding natural and rational objections to the possibility of the efficacy and operation of the Hahnemannian drugs when exhibited in Hahnemannian doses, various homœopaths have at different times anxiously endeavoured to give some appearance of foundation to their belief in the infinitesimal doses, by attempting to prove that these infinitesimal doses have sensible physical properties, and are capable of producing sensible physical results upon the healthy human body.

Thus, many years ago, Segin made experiments with the solar microscope upon the higher homœopathic dilutions of copper, and alleged that he could and did observe in them actual particles of metallic copper, even in preparations of the 200th dilution,—an assertion which,

to use the language of the editors of the "British Journal of Homœopathy," in regard to it, most certainly "we may take leave to doubt." Mayerhofer made experiments of a similar kind, equally wild and equally inconclusive. Rummell endeavoured to show with the solar microscope that the high potencies, or high dilutions, still contained quantities of the medicating drug, capable of being seen by the aid of that instrument. But the homœopathists now themselves admit, that "what Rummell saw was probably just the appearance alcohol presents under the microscope when *evaporating*!"¹ Within the last few months, however, it has again been supposed by homœopathists in general that at last they had acquired a sure and perfect means of being able both to prove the actual physical presence of infinitesimal doses in their Hahnemannian globules, and to give physical evidence of their action upon the healthy body by the aid of an instrument termed the "MAGNETOSCOPE," or "New Magnetic Indicator,"—the invention of Mr Rutter, manager of the Gas Works at Brighton.

In a lecture, delivered to the British Homœopathic Society in October last, upon the application of Mr Rutter's discovery to the visible proof of the physical action upon the body of the infinitesimal doses used by homœopathists, Dr Quin—the principal homœopathic practitioner in England—remarked:—

"Science (homœopathic science) has made a gigantic stride by the philosophical instrument and important discovery of that gentleman; and homœopathic practitioners especially are greatly indebted to him for having proved the physical action of our remedies in infinitesimal quantities upon the human body; and you will join with me heartily in doing honour to him for the great impetus he will be the means of giving to our cause. The only reason for sorrow is, that our revered master, Hahnemann, is not alive to witness this triumphant proof of his own great discoveries."²

The homœopathic world of England hailed this discovery with all due enthusiasm.

"The great barrier," observed Dr Quin, in his second Lecture, in October last, "which has prevented the majority of the members of the medical profession from inquiring into homœopathy, has been their repugnance to entertain, for a moment, the idea that the exiguous doses of medicine administered by homœopathic practitioners can have any effect whatever upon disease. This barrier is *now* broken down by the brilliant discovery and beautiful invention of Mr Rutter."³

¹ British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. vii. p. 446, and vol. v. p. 557.

² Homœopathic Times for October 18, 1851, where there is reported at length Dr Quin's first Lecture.

³ Ibid, October 25, 1851, p. 178.

"The results," observes the Editor of the "Homœopathic Times," "will be, so far as homœopathy is concerned—'a heavy blow and great discouragement' to the brute opponents, who only see an argument in numbers—and have no notion of any strength but that of physical force. By physical science shall *their* physical force be proved to be 0. . . . All may hear who have ears, all may see who have eyes, and all may understand who have any faculties of vision."¹

For the magnetoscope, according to the same writer, "besides its vast importance to the science of magnetism in all its forms, holds out the means of demonstrating the fact—that the homœopathic medicines *do* act on the human organism. This (he continues) is a discovery which would have gladdened the heart of Hahnemann had he been in the life of the body; this instrument which affords the means of proof of a fact the opponents of homœopathy have always rejected without inquiry, has been discovered at a most opportune time. We suppose Professor Christison will now CHANGE HIS OPINION OF HOMŒOPATHY, and, having changed it, will lose no time in avowing that he has done so. . . . We trust Faraday will take the subject up, and that every chemist who deserves the name will do likewise."²

Other men looked upon Mr Rutter's discovery of the Magnetoscope, not only with delight, but almost with feelings of veneration.

"I may be thought," (writes Dr King, a physician at Brighton, to Mr Rutter), "too fanciful in the view I take of your beautiful, and, as I think, sublime discovery, but no reflecting mind will deny, that we stand in need of some new principle or truth, to enable us to turn to full account those which we have already received.

* * * When I first saw your machine prove the polarity of a decillionth of a grain of silex, and when I first saw it respond to the billionth of a grain of quinine, I was seized with the same kind of awe as when I first studied the resolution of the nebulae, and as when I first saw the globules of blood and the filaments of the nerves through the microscope."³

The magnetoscope of Mr Rutter, the vast importance of which to homœopathy is so greatly and gravely vaunted of in the preceding extracts, is constructed on the principle of the well-known old divining rod and ring. But Mr Rutter's instrument is more complicated than the usual old forms of rhabdomantic apparatus. His magnetoscope consists of—1. A firm upright mahogany pillar; 2. Of a slender brass arm, fixed at right angles into the top of this pillar, passing through a brass cap or ball at its attached end, and tapering to a point towards its further or outer extremity; 3. Of a single thread, of the finest silk, passing from the outer extremity of the horizontal brass arm, and holding in suspension, at its lower end, a small button or pendulum of sealing wax; and, 4. Of a dial-plate, duly marked with circumferential letters like a compass or watch face, to show the movements of the pendulum of wax sus-

¹ Homœopathic Times for November 1, 1851, p. 209.

² Ibid, October 18, 1851, p. 171.

³ Mr Rutter's Pamphlet, pp. 46 and 47.

pended above it. In working the instrument, the operator places the thumb and finger of the right hand, one on each side, of the brass cap or ball fixed to the attached end of the horizontal brass arm, and immediately the wax pendulum moves over the face of the dial-plate in direct or reverse rotations, and in direct, transverse, or diagonal oscillations, according to the special influence or influences which he exerts.

"Mr Rutter has proved (says Dr Madden) that when the forefinger and thumb of the right hand of the operator are placed in contact with the fixed part of the machine, the pendulum is set in motion in a circle from left to right—this he terms the normal or direct current. Various circumstances, however, are capable of altering and modifying this current, producing reverse circular motion—*i. e.*, from right to left, or direct oscillation, *viz.*, in a straight line to and from the hand of the operator, or transverse oscillation, *viz.*, at right angles to the operator's hand ; in addition to which, there are oscillations for every point of the compass, and elliptical motions in every different direction, with direct and reverse currents ; and be it remembered, *every one of these are constant under similar circumstances*, and can of course be repeated at pleasure."—*British Journal of Homœopathy* for October 1851, p. 674.

These varied movements of the pendulum around and across the dial-plate of the magnetoscope are, we are confidently assured, modified and regulated by a variety of strange and incredible circumstances (every one of them, however, *constant* under similar circumstances), as by the sex of the operator ; by the instrument being touched by a finger alone, or a thumb alone ; by the left or free hand of the operator being touched by the finger of a male, or the finger of a female ; etc., etc. Thus, for example, "if (according to Mr Rutter), a female with her forefinger either touch or merely point at the left hand of the operator, reverse rotation of the pendulum will immediately occur ; but if a male do the same, diagonal oscillation of the pendulum will take place ; and the instrument can be affected by any number of persons forming a chain by conjoining hands, the *sex* of the person at the *end* of the chain, or most remote from the operator, determining the motion of the instrument. If a piece of ivory, a feather, or a dead fly be held in the left hand of the operator, the motion of the pendulum (says Mr Rutter) will cease." If gold, platinum, silver, copper, etc., be held in the left hand, the results, according to Mr Rutter, are as follows :—"gold, silver, and copper, produce reverse rotation of the pendulum ; platinum produces direct oscillation," etc. A hair from the head of a female, a lady's handkerchief, or a letter written (even several weeks previously), if laid

upon the left hand of the operator, will produce "reverse rotation" of the magnetoscope; while, on the contrary, a male hair, handkerchief, or letter, will produce direct rotation of the pendulum; thus indicating the sex of the proprietor or writer.¹

Dr Quin, who, with a "jury" of other physicians, etc., witnessed the performance of many experiments by Mr Rutter, attests the truth of the following, among other observations:—

"After having put (says he) the instrument in full normal action, by applying the finger and thumb of the right hand, a *dead fly* being put on his (Mr Rutter's) *left* hand, the motion of the pendulum immediately ceased; on the fly being taken away, the motion re-commenced. A chain of several men holding one another by the hand, was formed, a *female* placed her hand on that of the man most remote from the operator, the motion of the instrument was immediately reversed, the circulatory motion being from right to left. A dead fly was then put upon the left hand of the female, and the motion immediately stopped. A wire of copper, 500 feet long, encased in gutta serena, was then added to the chain of men, the one farthest from the operator held one end of the wire, and the female the other end; the *female influence* was immediately sent through both the wire and chain of men, and a corresponding action was again set up, which was again *stopped immediately* by the dead fly being put upon the other hand. Similar experiments were made with other dead matter, even merely by holding the hand over or *near* the dead matter, the aura of which equally stopped the motion."—*From Dr Quin's Lecture in Homœopathic Times*, October 18th, p. 165.

"If (again remarks Dr Quin), a person of the female sex *merely breathes* upon the hand of the operator, it immediately *changes* the current to the female; if a man *breathes* upon her hand, her other hand being in contact with the operator, the *male influence* is immediately perceived on the pendulum. If a *hair of a female* is placed on the hand of the operator, or the hand of the last of any number of men in contact with him, the *female* current is immediately produced. The same phenomenon is produced by a pocket-handkerchief worn by a lady."—*Ibid*, p. 166.

Such were some of the marvellous results alleged to be obtained by experiments with the magnetoscope; and these results occurred (according to Dr Quin's evidence), "with unvarying and unerring" certainty, each time they were repeated, "so as to carry conviction to all who witnessed them, even the most sceptical." Indeed—

"Mr Rutter who (says Dr Quin) is a man, as you may suppose, of great scientific knowledge, *leaves no loophole for scepticism*, the beautiful series of experiments made by him all tending to corroborate and confirm one another. The instrument is so subtle, and the demonstration so clear, whilst the experiments are at the same time so delicate and exact, the same cause repeated *invariably* producing the same effect, that no one can resist the positive evidence of the undeviating action of this scientific and highly philosophical instrument."—(*Ibid*, p. 163.)

It was, it will be readily conceded, a very slight step, and a

¹ See these and other additional experiments of the kind in Mr Rutter's pamphlet—*Magnetoid currents, etc., with a Description of the Magnetoscope*—p. 19, etc.

very natural idea to connect this rhabdomancy with homœopathy. Seeing that a “dead fly,” a “male hair,” a “lady’s breath,” etc., could work at such distances such strange and striking effects upon the indications of the magnetoscope, it was next to certain that homœopathic infinitesimal doses would exact some similar potent influence upon the instrument. Dr Madden had the merit of extending the magnetoscope to this branch of inquiry, though this merit was partly claimed for others. “It would (says the editor of the *Homœopathic Times*), be very difficult to overrate the importance of the magnetoscope. It is quite clear that Mr Rutter has not only invented the instrument, but that he discovered the action upon it of small particles of matter, etc. But it is also clear that the full credit is due to Dr Madden, of having immediately instituted an elaborate series of experiments to ascertain the value of the instrument to homœopathy in particular. He has had the start, was the first on the course, and has brought to the task qualities and attainments which admirably fit him to conduct and systematise such experiments.”¹ A few pages further on (p. 188), we are told, that already Dr Madden has “indefatigably and unremittingly pursued, for near *three months*, daily investigations upon this point, which is so interesting and important to the homœopathists.”

The results of the experiments with the magnetoscope, instituted by Dr Madden, Dr Quin, and other homœopathists, were, as far as regarded homœopathy, various in their kind and character; but all of them of alleged great moment. I quote their three most important results from the *British Journal of Homœopathy* for October 1851, as laid down by Dr Madden in the following propositions:—

I. “I can now render evident to the senses the action of our remedies, even at the *highest potencies*.”

II. “I can demonstrate physically the truth of the homœopathic law, [*similia similibus curantur*]; and,

III. “I can prove the action of our remedies to be, in a certain sense, totally independent of *quantity*.”

In October last, numerous experiments were made and shown by Dr Quin to the British Homœopathic Society, and by Dr Madden to the Hahnemann Medical Society, in support of the truth of these propositions. It would be tedious to detail the minutiae of them as given in the reports of their published lectures. A few examples may suffice.

¹ *Homœopathic Times* for October 25, p. 183.

For instance, Dr Quin found that one globule of the 30th dilution of copper, or of the 30th or even 800th dilution of sulphur, when laid in the left hand of the operator, produced the reverse rotation of the pendulum of the magnetoscope; a globule made from a 30th or a 200th solution of zinc, sent the pendulum round from H to E of the dial-plate; and when a globule of the 200th dilution of this metal was dissolved in an ounce of water, and a drop of the resulting solution placed in the hand, the same movement of the instrument followed; while globules of digitalis, sundew, cayenne pepper, etc., when applied to the hand of the operator stopped the instrument.

Again, Dr Madden showed publicly various similar experiments. On laying a globule of the 20th dilution of bryony in the palm of the left hand, he proved that a motion of the pendulum was produced in a line running N.W.; globules of chalk sent the pendulum into a motion N. and S.; iodide of potass, N.E.; muriate of ammonia, an oscillation in a long narrow ellipse lying N. and S., etc. etc. To avoid error in these and in his other "three months'" experiments, he tried, as he informs us, "the effects of pure sugar of milk and of unmedicated globules," and thus satisfied himself that the effects produced were dependent solely on the medicine.¹ "Every remedy (he states) which I have yet tried, and they have been mineral, vegetable, and animal, manifestly affects the normal magnetic currents now proved to exist in our bodies, and this effect is just as readily produced by globules of the 6th, 12th, and 30th potencies, as by the lowest trituration." Dr Madden further proved to the Hahnemann Medical Society that doses far more minute and infinitesimal than those of Jenichen's, Rummell's, and Nunez's, and the possibility of the action of which upon the diseased body had been derided by most rational men, could, by the evidence of the magnetoscope, be proved to have a distinct and decided action even upon the healthy body of man. In the published report of the lecture it is, for instance, stated—"The power of *Arsenic* in

¹ *Journal of Homœopathy* for October, p. 675. In experimenting with the Magnetoscope, Dr Madden placed the homœopathic globules "on the back of his left hand." Placing the globules on the tongue produced, however, he thought, more permanent results; (and hence, perhaps, placing them in the stomach itself still more chronic effects). "I once (he ingenuously tells us) tried putting the medicine on the tongue; but one globule of *Sepia* 12, altered the normal motion (of the Magnetoscope), and retained it in its altered condition for FULLY TWO HOURS; so that it was far too serious a loss of time to proceed in that way!"

stopping the normal current was exhibited as well by a single globule of the 40,000th dilution as by a quantity of the first trituration. *Sulphur* in substance, in the 30th dilution, and in the 7,000th dilution, had *equally* the effect of reversing the natural current.”¹

Dr Madden’s *third* “important” induction from his experiments (see preceding extract p. 124),—viz., that the action of homœopathic doses and globules was independent of the QUANTITY of medicine which they contained,—was based upon the experiment last quoted, and upon similar experiments with other drugs. He tells us that he found experimentally with the Magnetoscope, that globules of sulphur, for instance, of different dilutions or strengths, or having very different quantities of the drug in their composition, all (when tested by the instrument), affected “the current equally rapidly, in precisely the same manner, and without any detectable difference of force.” This result was of course necessary to confirm the dogma of Hahnemann as to the action of medicines being independent of quantity,—provided they were given in doses “sufficiently minute, *i.e.*, as small as possible” (*Organon*, p. 306). And accordingly, Dr Quin confirms this same result with his magnetoscope experience. “The different experiments (he observes) which I have laid before you, and the many modifications which I have demonstrated to you various medicines have upon one another, illustrate, in a *most* remarkable and beautiful manner, the soundness and correctness of ONE of Hahnemann’s discoveries, that the virtues of medicines do not depend upon the QUANTITY, in which they are prescribed. No sensible difference has as yet been detected between the effect produced by a substance in a large dose, and the same substance in the *minutest* homœopathic dose.”—(*Lecture*, p. 182.)

Dr Madden’s *Second* published proposition, from his experiments with the magnetoscope, amounted to this—“I can demonstrate physically (by it) the truth of the homœopathic law (*similia similibus curantur*,”) (see antecedently, p. 124). He regards this actual ocular

¹ *Homœopathic Times*, October 25, 1851, p. 187. The 40,000th dilution of arsenic said to be used in these experiments by Dr Madden is a suppositious amount of arsenic which would be represented by a 1 followed by 80,000 ciphers! The text in which this present essay is printed contains on an average about 2,000 letters in each page. To represent, then, the quantity of a grain of arsenic supposed to exist in a globule of the 40,000th dilution, would require a 1 followed by 40 pages of ciphers!

exhibition of the homœopathic law, by the effect of a medicine upon a similar medicine, in magnetoscopic experiments, as the most interesting of his results. "But the most beautiful experiment (says he) I have yet performed, is the rendering VISIBLE homœopathic action."

"For this purpose (he observes), I arranged the following experiments:—1st, I tried mercurius in the usual way, and found that it reversed the normal current; 2d, I tested bismuth, and found that it likewise reversed the current. (These two drugs had, consequently, a homœopathic or similar action on the magnetoscope); 3d, I then got the operator to touch the magnetoscope, and set up the normal current; having done so, I placed some *bismuth 1st trit.* on the back of his left hand, which, as formerly, reversed the current; and then, with the current fully reversed, I placed on the same hand some *mercurius 3d dec. trit.*, and the current at once became unsteady, and, within a minute, *returned* to its normal direction,—thus showing (adds Dr Madden) that two substances dissimilar to each other, but each equally capable of reversing the current, *mutually destroy each other's effects*, and, accordingly, the normal current is restored."

In his lecture to the Hahnemann Society, Dr Madden proceeded even a step further, and with equal facility proved experimentally, by the magnetoscope, other matters important to homœopathic science, besides the three propositions or inductions previously enunciated by him. For he showed experimentally to the Society, that the magnetoscope not only rendered *visible* the truth of the homœopathic law, *similia similibus*, but equally rendered *visible* also the falsity of one of the alleged allopathic laws, *contraria contrariis curantur*. I quote from the published report of the lecture:—

"To illustrate (the report states) the principle of *similia similibus*, Dr Madden showed that, whilst arsenic and opium *separately* stopped the motion, when *taken together* into the hand, the normal motion was immediately set up. Dr Madden then created much amusement, by exhibiting what he called the principle of *contraria contrariis*. *Belladonna* and *cantharis* both cause an elliptical pendulum motion in the north-west direction; but the one causes the direct motion, the other the reverse. When both were placed in the operator's hand, there was at first a long pause; and, at length, after an apparently painful struggle of currents, *resembling the convalescence under allopathy*, the normal current was feebly restored."—(*Homœopathic Times* for October 25, p. 187.)

In their so-called provings of drugs, the homœopathists, in their experiments, have always exhibited a marvellous power of finding that their infinitesimal proving doses always produced the very effects which they theoretically and previously desired. They have shown exactly the same marvellous control over the provings of Hahnemann's dogmas and tenets with the magnetoscope; for its incontrovertible evidence at once decided the entire truth of other homœo-

pathic doctrines, besides those already specified above. Thus we have already seen (p. 45) that one of Hahnemann's mighty discoveries and tenets was, that the medicinal action of drugs was not only wondrously augmented, but indefinitely increased, by TRITURATION.¹ Of course the magnetoscope also proved this. At his lecture to the Hahnemann Medical Society, to exhibit the effects of *trituration*, "Dr Madden took some untrituated Lycopodium into his hand, which had no influence on the pendulum, but a portion of the same Lycopodium in the first trituration produced an *immediate* effect."—(*Homœopathic Times* for October 25, p. 187.) The magnetoscope confirmed also at once another of Hahnemann's great discoveries.

"Nothing (says Dr Quin) can be *more beautiful* and more satisfactory than to witness the results upon Mr Rutter's instrument of the experiments with the ANTIDOTES to various medicines, indicated by Hahnemann in his works. Our revered master, by dint of long, patient, and persevering experiments upon the effect of various medicines upon the healthy body, discovered a number of antidotes to some of these medicines, and in other instances, only to some of the effects of each medicine experimented upon. In other instances, he corrected many errors into which medical authors had fallen, with respect to the powers of some antidotes. Mr Rutter's instrument corroborates in *the most satisfactory and most beautiful manner* the experiments of Hahnemann."—(*Homœopathic Times*, November 1, 1851, p. 204.)

The preceding grand magnetoscopic discoveries relative to the tenets and truths of homœopathy, and the visible action of infinitesimal doses of drugs upon the living and healthy human body, were naturally proclaimed loudly by homœopaths everywhere, as well as at London and Brighton. Homœopaths at Liverpool, and elsewhere, showed the effects of the most refined homœopathic globules upon the magnetoscope to their wondering and credulous patients and patrons. In Edinburgh, the discovery was spoken of by some as quite decisive of the fate and success of homœopathy. A writer in *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal*, described in an article of considerable length, Dr Madden's magnetoscopic experiments with the homœopathic globules, etc., as experiments, the truth of which was "beyond suspicion."

"It will be seen (says he) that this new branch of magnetology, though here shown in more or less connection with homœopathy, and with what has hitherto been known

¹ "The development of power (in drugs) by succussion and trituration, Hahnemann holds to be one of the greatest discoveries of the age; by them the medicinal power may be 'potentised almost to infinity.'"—*British Journal of Homœopathy* for 1849, p. 444.

as animal magnetism, has no necessary dependance on these prescribed subjects; neither are these the difficulties of proof, and the apparent openness to fraud, and the consequent disinclination of many to experiment which attend the latter. The opponents of these systems are apt to regard everything which succeeds as a collusion or an accident, and every failure as a damnatory proof; and the repugnance even to experiment is extreme.

"Here the student may acquaint himself with phenomena as curious, and, at first thought, as incredible as any that have aroused the indignant incredulity of the wise. Jealous for the honour of the human intellect and the dignity of the established authorities—phenomena produced by the unassisted experimenter, consisting in gross material movements, LEAVING NO ROOM FOR DELUSION NOR ILLUSION."—*Chambers' Journal*, December 13, 1851, p. 377.

"I have (says the President of the British Homœopathic Society) witnessed several hundred experiments upon Mr Rutter's instrument, and I have never found it vary once; the same cause repeated, *invariably* produces the same effect. Try the instrument as you will, it never errs; IT HAS ALL THE CERTAINTY OF A MATHEMATICAL EQUATION."¹

Hahnemann, in his works, repeatedly scolds and declaims against those allopathic practitioners, who quietly, but sceptically, refused all belief, either in his doctrines, or in his own strong asseverations of his so-called "facts." Thus, in one passage of his *Organon*, after duly upbraiding "the material ideas of common-place physicians,"—he exclaims—"their idle declamations must cease before the dicta of infallible experience!"; and two pages farther on, he again reiterates—"How unmeaning and ridiculous is mere theoretical scepticism, in opposition to this unerring, infallible, *experimental proof!*"—(*Organon*, p. 324 and 326.)

Nothing, surely, in the way of "experimental proof," could possibly be stronger,—or at least, nothing of the kind could be stated in stronger terms,—than we find the evidence in favour of the sensible physical action of homœopathic globules, as established by the magnetoscope, announced in the preceding extracts and observations by some of Hahnemann's most distinguished disciples. In these passages, they apply to the magnetoscopic evidence the very same strong and uncompromising language of assertion, which they have long been in the habit of applying to all other forms of so-called homœopathic evidence. In relation to the one as to the other, they professedly appeal to "infallible experience," and "un-

¹ Dr Quin's Inaugural Lecture, in *Homœopathic Times* for October 25, 1851, p. 179.

erring experimental proof;" and, doubtlessly, with equal truth in both instances; but not with equal success in both. It is difficult to show to some minds the utter fallacy of "unerring, infallible, experimental proof," in relation to the practice of homœopathy in the treatment of disease, because vital actions (the powers of the *vis medicatrix*, etc.) here come into play, and render the proof a matter of doubt at least, if not of difficulty. But the fallacy of "unerring, infallible, experimental proof," in relation to the preceding questions regarding the magnetoscope, can be far more easily shown, because in this case vitality and its influence does not intervene to derange the evidence. On the contrary, that evidence is principally of a physical character, and consequently can be tried by the more sure and certain laws applicable to physical investigations;—tests which we can never apply with the same incontrovertible clearness and certainty to vital investigations.

The passages which I have cited in the previous pages from Drs Quin, Madden, etc., regarding the marvellous proofs in favour of homœopathy, derivable from the revelations of the magnetoscope, were for the most part published during the autumnal months of the last year (1851). The first weeks of winter brought with them ominous clouds, which at first dimmed, and at last utterly darkened the bright prospects of the homœopaths. Immediately after Dr Madden's second lecture on the magnetoscope, in the London Hahnemann Hospital, in the latter days of October, the "fifth act" began; and in a few weeks the whole *denouement* of the comedy was complete. Before this period, it is true, some differences of opinion regarding the homœopathic revelations made by the magnetoscope had arisen. The instrument, according to Dr Quin, "never errs; it has all the certainty of a mathematical equation." But, in experimenting with it upon homœopathic drugs, Dr Madden and he got very different results in testing the very same medicines with the magnetic indicator; "the effects of *twelve* out of *sixteen* medicines recorded by Dr Quin, differing from those of the same medicines," when tested by Dr Madden. Dr Quin, however, had at hand a ready solution for explaining this apparent contradiction. It might be true, he allowed, that the magnetoscope did not give out the same indications with the same medicines, when tested by him and by Dr Madden; but then, subtilely and calmly argued Dr Quin—Dr Madden has not yet been many years a homœopathist, and can one

“depend (to use Dr Quin’s own words), upon his (Dr Madden’s) *body* being sufficiently free from lingering medicinal effects, *originating* before his conversion to homœopathy?”¹ And of course, according to this exquisite logie, the old allopathic state of Dr Madden’s body varied and affected the magnetoscopic results.²

A greater explosion, however, of all the magnetoscopic hopes of homœopathists was in preparation, than any mere, though direct difference of results as obtained from it respectively by Dr Quin and Dr Madden. In the *Homœopathic Times* for November 8, Dr Madden (who, according to previous evidence of the *Times*, possessed “qualities and attainments which admirably fit him to conduct the magnetoscopic inquiry,”) published a letter, cruelly blighting all the bright and brilliant hopes which he had already excited in the homœopathic world, relative to the homœopathic and other almost divine revelations of the magnetoscope; and commencing his own process of retraction.

“It is, I can assure you (writes Dr Madden), no pleasant duty which I have now to perform—viz., to make known the fact that my recent experiments have detected a most serious source of fallacy in all the previous ones, and go far to show that it will be of little or *no real value* to us as demonstrating the action of homœopathic remedies.”—(*Homœopathic Times*, November 8, p. 233.)

A few weeks later, Dr Madden sent a retraction, if possible still more complete, to the *British Journal of Homœopathy*.

¹ *Homœopathic Times*, November 1, p. 201.

² Two or three of the more unscrupulous and dishonest practitioners of homœopathy are also in the habit of citing this characteristic reason, as an argument for their credulous patients not being fit subjects for the wonders of homœopathic cures by homœopathic doses; or at least not fit till they have been under their medical treatment for a long course of time. It is difficult to fancy any kind of charlatanry more dishonourable than this; and it is a trick to which I believe no honest homœopathic physician resorts. The so-called “provings” of medicine by their own founder is in itself a sufficient argument against this mode of delusion; for, in making these “provings,” Hahnemann and his friends, as we have already seen, swallowed (see p. 70), in the first instance, in their *ordinary* medicinal doses, and for a length of time, many of the principal and most potent remedies used by physicians. The “lingering medical effects” (to use Dr Quin’s language) of these reiterated courses of different “allopathic” drugs, in allopathic doses, are stated by Hahnemann himself, in the following terms, in his *Organon*:—“Experience,” says he, “shows that the organism of the experimenter becomes, by these frequent attacks on his health, all the more expert in repelling all external influences inimical to his frame, and all artificial and natural morbid noxious agents, and becomes more hardened to resist everything of an injurious character, by means of these moderate experiments on his own person with medicines. His health becomes more unalterable; he becomes more robust, as all experience shows.”—*Organon*, p. 227.

"I regret (he states) to say that my hopes of advantage to homœopathy, arising from the revelations of the magnetoscope, have been much damped by the results of larger experience of its workings. Up to the present time, I have *neither seen nor heard of any experiments* which demonstratively prove the magnetic nature of the movements of the pendulum; and having ascertained that *ALL the various movements can be produced by* EXTREMELY SLIGHT VOLUNTARY MOVEMENTS on the part of the operator, and having moreover convinced myself, and those who have witnessed my experiments, that in all the ordinary experiments with the magnetoscope, unconscious movements on the part of the operator do take place, I have been CONSTRAINED TO CONCLUDE that in its present condition the magnetoscope CANNOT be relied upon as a physical test of the action of our remedies."—(*Journal of Homœopathy* for January 1852, p. 175.)

After this complete, and, let me add, honest retraction by Dr Madden, regarding the entire fallacy of the supposed homœopathic marvels and revelations, which he and other disciples of Hahnemann at one time "felt certain" would result from "infallible, unerring, experimental proof" with the magnetoscope, it is perhaps unnecessary to enquire, at any length, into the sources of error inherent in the instrument and in its construction. Let me merely state, that, as appears from a letter published by Dr Cowan of Reading (see *Lancet* for November 22), Mr Rutter was himself long before aware that if he tried to perform any of his "certain" experiments upon the magnetoscope with his "*eyes bandaged*," then under such circumstances the experiments failed, and the instrument did not exhibit its own previous "invariable" indications. In other words, it was not the *mere touch* of the manipulator's hand that was the cause of the special gyrations of the pendulum, under special conditions or experiments; his EYE also (and consequently his *mind*) were indispensably necessary, in order that the alleged "invariable" result might occur. But the EYE itself could have no influence upon the Magnetoscope or its pendulum, except by showing to the operator whether or not the pendulum was taking the direction which he expected his *touch* of the ball of the apparatus to produce, and by enabling him to regulate and guide the effect of that touch upon the instrument. In short, though it was at first urgently and expressly declared that it is evident that the "anticipated result is NOT an element in the experiments;"¹ yet all the later observations of Dr Madden and others have fully demonstrated that the anticipations of the manipulator have, on the contrary, everything to do with the results, and form the primary element in producing

¹ Dr Quin, in *Homœopathic Times* for November 1, 1851, p. 201.

these results. In other words, the results themselves, or indications offered by the pendulum, are all of them the effects, to use the language of Dr Madden, of "slight voluntary motions,"—so slight as latterly to become "unconscious muscular movements,"—in the fingers of the operator as he touches the instrument, his EYE enabling him to do so, in such a way as to guide and correct the motions of the apparatus, so as to produce the old alleged "invariability" in the gyrations of the indicating pendulum;—or (to express the facts more correctly) the state of *expectant attention* in the mind of the operator, involuntarily on his part, sets in action, as his fingers touch the ball of the magnetoscope, muscular movements in his hand, calculated to produce the *expected* result in the instrument,—his eye supplying him with information, so as to enable him unconsciously to guide the gyrations of the pendulum, and produce any particular movement, or movements, of it across the dial, which were precalculated and fixed in his own thoughts.¹

"It was (observes Dr Madden in his first letter of retractation) long ago pointed out to Mr Rutter, and he has fully acknowledged the fact, that *unless you pay attention to the pendulum*, no definite movements take place. The idea occurred to me that possibly this attention to the pendulum drew off my attention to my own body, and that I might accordingly make *unconscious muscular movements*, capable of influencing the machine. I determined, therefore, to watch the pendulum, and attend to my own sensations at the same time. I found, *to my dismay*, that when I resolutely determined NOT to move my body (or fingers) in the slightest degree, *no motion* of the pendulum took place when I held the instrument in the usual way."

"I find (he continues) 1. That in the ordinary condition of the magnetoscope, *ANY motion which is anticipated INVARIABLY takes place*. 2. If I apply merely the point of any of my fingers to the brass ball, and *wish* for any motion to occur, it *takes place immediately*, without my being conscious of any muscular motion on my part. 3. If a (homœopathic) medicine is put into my hands without my having any possible clue to its nature, *the motions no longer coincide with my former observations*; so much so indeed, that of six medicines which have been tested in this way four times each, no one agreed more than twice, and two of them gave different motions every time they were tested."—*Dr Madden's Letter in Homœopathic Times* of November 8th.

Dr Madden in the same letter further shows, that the facility with which the ultimate result is produced upon the pendulum, by the finger of the manipulator primarily touching the brass ball of

¹ On the marked effects of *Attention* and *fixed Expectation* on bodily organs and movements, independently of volition or emotion, and even often in despite of volition, see an excellent chapter in Dr Holland's late work on "Mental Physiology," and some clear and masterly remarks by Dr Carpenter, in the *Medico-Chirurgical Review* for July 1852, p. 222.

the machine, depends upon the *mechanical* construction of the machine itself.

"I arranged (he states) a series of experiments, from which it appears that whenever a machine is so constructed as to admit of the greatest effect being produced by the smallest amount of mechanical motion—(which is unfortunately the case with Mr Rutter's instrument, it being, in fact, a combination of three levers acted upon at the *most advantageous point to obtain the greatest effect from the smallest efforts*), such machine will act perfectly as a magnetoscope, even though all the known laws of induction are set at defiance in its construction ; while, on the contrary, every modification of the machine which *increases its IMMOBILITY, decreases in the same proportion its apparent sensibility* to the so-called magnetic currents. Under these circumstances, I fear (continues Dr Madden) we are bound to conclude that Mr Rutter's magnetoscope, in its present form, is not applicable to experiments with homœopathic remedies."

I have already stated, that the fallacies of the magnetoscope experiments and proofs, began to be seen immediately after Dr Madden's second lecture on the subject had been given at the Hahnemann Hospital in the last days of October. And Dr Madden tells us he had been led to entertain some suspicions even before that painful exhibition by him of the powers of the Magnetoscope, to prove by philosophic "experimentation" the tenets of homœopathy, and disprove those of allopathy. After that night, at least, further "experimentation" of this kind with the Magnetoscope became difficult or impossible. For one of Dr Madden's audience, who, notwithstanding Dr Madden's arguments, still believed that "all the movements of the pendulum were due to involuntary motion of the operator's hand," so far confirmed his opinions upon Dr Madden himself, by inducing him to make "various additional experiments" after the lecture, when the instrument gave out the wrong responses, upon letters written by gentlemen and ladies, etc., being placed in Dr Madden's hand, and Dr Madden being kept in ignorance of the sex of the writer. In speaking of other experiments which he induced Dr Madden to perform after lecture, this writer adds, that also—

"Several experiments were made with globules, the nature of which was unknown to him (Dr Madden); but as the results were doubtful, and he was at the time not only in a state of exhaustion, but of pain, it would not be fair to dwell upon them."

And in evidence of the rapidity with which mental states may unconsciously affect the muscles of the fingers and other parts, the same writer correctly observes,—

"We see hourly illustrations of it in the ever-varying expressions of the human face—expressions produced, as is well known, by involuntary and unconscious mus-

cular movements, which follow with the most marvellous rapidity and exactness, all the various shades of thought and feeling.”¹

A “Physician,” writing in the “Homœopathic Times,” who performed for himself a variety of magnetoscopic experiments, tells us that the results of his investigations were as follow:—

“I found (observes he) that in whatever way my hand was connected with the instrument, I could invariably, by my will alone, almost instantly cause the pendulum to oscillate in any given direction. It is merely necessary for me to think of any special direction, or of a cessation of movement, and the pendulum immediately acts accordingly. The effort required to produce these results is very slight. In this way the pendulum can be caused to move backwards and forwards from the person of the operator; or from right to left, and back again; or in any direction between these two currents; or elliptically, or in a circle, either ‘normal’ or ‘reverse;’ or lastly, it can be brought to a dead stand. The movements may be rendered fainter or more marked at pleasure.”—*Homœopathic Times*, November 8, p. 232.

All the later experimenters who have published their results, have come to exactly the same conclusion as Dr Madden; and some of them have adduced proofs, even, if possible, still more certain and conclusive than those which we have mentioned above. The Natural History Society of Torquay had the instrument submitted to them. Their reporter tells us, that it entirely failed in its responses. And he points to this important experiment, that though—(as Dr Quin at least alleges)—it should manifest the presence of a dead fly in the hand of a man divided from the operator by a wire of copper five hundred feet long; yet, when the hand of the operator himself was divided from the instrument by a short wire or chain (one end of the wire or chain touching the ball of the magnetoscope, and the other held in his hand), no effect followed. But due effects most undoubtedly ought to have followed, if the motions of the instrument were not actually the result of the direct touching and manipulation of the ball by the fingers of the operator, and of the consequent guidance of the pendulum by that touch.

With Dr Madden, and other homœopaths, the leading English homœopathic periodical (the *Journal of Homœopathy*) has publicly retracted its previously expressed belief in the importance of the “homœopathic facts,” capable of being revealed by the Magnetoscope.

In the Number of that Journal for October 1851, Dr Madden

¹ *Homœopathic Times*, November 8, 1851, p. 233

inserted a letter, from which I have several times quoted, containing a pretty full account of the results of his magnetoscopic experiments up to that date. The series of experiments in which Dr Madden is "at present occupied, though still incomplete, he considers (observe the Editors) of *great importance* to homœopathy, in which opinion we fully agree with him"—(p. 674). "We trust (it is again remarked in another Editorial note) that Dr Madden will pursue these investigations, which even in their present state are so interesting to the homœopathist, and which we have no doubt will be productive of important results—(p. 676).

But alas! by the time the next Number of the same Journal was published, three months subsequently, viz., in January 1852, matters had entirely altered in reference to this mighty investigation "of great importance" for homœopathy; the crisis had already arrived, and the bubble had burst: Dr Madden had fully retracted, and the Editors of the *Journal of Homœopathy* had no course left but to resile with him. Dr Madden (observe the Editors, p. 102) wrote a letter on the subject, which was inserted in the last number of this Journal. As things (they continue) have turned out, and indeed might have been foreseen, it is a thousand pities that letter was published. . . . Dr Madden has ended in giving the thing up. Like the unhappy Mayo, he finds the movements *all* produced by the play of his muscles, and then he rides off in a cloud of learned words, well calculated to darken counsel."

After a variety of other observations, the Editors of the *Homœopathic Journal* observe:—

"There is one tragic-comic circumstance attendant on these experiments, even in the best of hands, which transpires again and again in the course of this narrative. Not only does Mr Rutter disclaim everything like theory (the word Magnetoscope notwithstanding), but he tells the reader gravely, that the experiments often fail. They often failed with himself at first. Some people cannot get up the currents at all, it would almost appear. But then, *practice* brings perfection. It is not to be expected that a person who sees and takes hold of an ordinary tool for the first time, should be able to use it with the facility acquired by long practice. Give it a fair trial. Half an hour's practice will sometimes do wonders. A few hours will certainly bring out something. If not, have patience. ['Try for a few minutes at a time, three or four minutes a-day, and for several weeks in succession. This (says Mr Rutter) is what I mean by a *fair trial*.']"—(P. 15 of his Pamphlet.)] "Doubtless (continue the Editors of the Journal), this is intended as a piece of frank pleading, but it is also strange nonsense. Since all that the operator has to do is to touch the knob, to grasp it kindly between his forefinger and thumb, perseverance and effort are put out of the question. If there be any motiferous fluid in him, whether magnetoid or odylic, it will run along the arm and down the thread, whether he will or not. Otherwise,

all pretensions to a physical character in the experiments must be given over. . . . To adjure him to perseverance is to mock him. . . . O Reader of ours, say we, is there any *need* of further refuting these experimentations?"¹

We believe there is no such "need." But at the same time we believe, also, with the author of a very able article on this subject in the *Lancet* for 15th November 1851, that the whole matter is one calculated, in relation to the effects and vagaries of human credulity, to teach all of us in unmistakable language, a lesson "of great importance," viz., that "Globulism is neither more nor less true than the wonders of this famous Instrument; the same intellects, dealing with similar evidence, have supported both the one and the other; and they have shown, at least to a demonstration, that they have reached the utmost confines of folly and dupedom. The whole evidence, if such a term may be prostituted in favour of their vaunted system, is of the *same* calibre, worthy of the *same* trust, and having the *same* credibility as that brought to bear on the 'new Magnetic Indicator.'²

And hence the reason why I have devoted so long a chapter to the history of this characteristic topic.

¹ The author of this article in the *Homœopathic Journal*, offers, in conclusion the following observations regarding an attempted resuscitation of the Magnetoscope by M. Leger:—"It further appears that a Dr Leger (a French gentleman, we presume, probably a *cadet* of the old honoured house, *de Main*, at this present moment in the very highest honour at Paris), is making a weekly exhibition of the Magnetoscope at Hungerford Hall; and that, as a matter of course, to crowds of good judges, doubtless the admiring pupils of Professor Anderson of the North. This is as it should be, too; for it restores the good old divining ring to its original honours. It places it in the right hand, before the right eyes; and it is welcome to swing there in peace till doomsday."—(P. 107.)

² *Lancet* for 1851, p. 472.

CHAPTER XIV.

HUMAN CREDULITY—ITS VARIOUS FORMS IN PAST AND PRESENT TIMES ; ANALOGIES IN THESE FORMS ; AS BETWEEN WITCHCRAFT AND HOMŒOPATHY IN REGARD TO SPIRITUAL INFLUENCES, TRANSFORMATIONS, DEFIANCE OF PHYSICAL LAWS, ETC.

IN the history of the human mind, few things are more interesting or more instructive than from time to time to turn back and consider the so-called sciences and strange delusions in which our predecessors of former ages placed implicit belief. To us at the present day it seems almost incredible that men—and these often the greatest and wisest men of their age—should have solemnly and very generally believed, for example, in the doctrines of Augury, of Astrology, of Alchemy, of Sorcery, etc., etc.

Nor, in pursuit of the same line of thought, is it less striking—though it is confessedly far more humbling—to look around at the present hour, and consider for a moment the analogous living delusions that for a time are enjoying temporary repute and fashion among us, but which, doubtlessly, will ultimately share the fate of the innumerable similar spurious “sciences” and “systems” which have preceded them. In this respect, the experience of the present time is only like the experience of all past time, proving, as it does, in too many and in too marked instances, the innate truth of Southey’s observation, that, naturally, “man is a dupeable animal, and quacks in medicine, quacks in religion, and quacks in politics, know this—and live upon the knowledge of it.” It will certainly be difficult for our descendants to point to a more striking illustration of this remark in the nineteenth century than is to be found in the present belief, or at least profession of belief, by some minds in that which a modern critic has designated, “a system of medical quackery, more adapted to the era of the declining Greek and Roman civilisa-

tion, than the culmination of the European," namely, homœopathy; for, in various of its tenets and doctrines, homœopathy stands perhaps really unequalled in extravagance with any system of delusion that has, in any former times of ignorance and darkness, formed an object of human credulity and belief.

Of all the delusions that have from time to time fixed the attention and gained the faith of mankind, witchcraft is most generally referred to by modern authors as a strange and well-known example of an exploded science or creed, involving an amount of folly and credulity on the part of our forefathers that now seems to us almost inconceivable. Indeed, the history of witchcraft is constantly alluded to as displaying an extent and extravagance of human belief, so glaring and monstrous in its details, that it is almost impossible to conceive that men, otherwise rational and intelligent, should have ever accorded credence to its alleged workings and wonders. Yet we know only too painfully from the pages of history, that formerly witchcraft "numbered its victims by tens of thousands, and its votaries by millions."

We always see, however, the faults and follies of others far more clearly than we can perceive our own. While we can easily appreciate the true character of those various delusions that have long passed and vanished, we are often enough strangely and obstinately blind to the true character of the analogous delusions and so-called sciences by which we may ourselves be actually surrounded. Many disciples of homœopathy of the present time, would perhaps deem it derogatory to be regarded as not more rational in their creed and credulity than the now despised disciples of witchcraft of former times. Yet certainly such is only too truly the actual fact. The tenets of homœopathy, as enunciated in the nineteenth century, may be dressed up in more modern and attractive phraseology than we find the tenets of witchcraft described in the accounts of it handed down to us from the fifteenth or the sixteenth centuries. But, in reality, to any one who will consider the subject calmly and without prejudice, the actual dogmas and delusions themselves which formerly constituted the creed of witchcraft, will not be found to exceed greatly, if indeed they exceed at all, in singularity and incredibility, the actual dogmas and delusions which constitute the prevailing creed of Hahnemann and his followers. Let us take one or two of the more leading and prominent points in each creed as illustrations of this remark.

In relation to witchcraft, three of the main or principal doctrines entertained were,—First, that human beings who desired to be practitioners of witchcraft could always obtain, for their own use on earth, by special means and exorcisms, the aid and assistance of spiritual powers from the spiritual world; secondly, that those who obtained these powers could temporarily transform their own bodies, or the bodies of other men, into the shapes of different species of animals; and thirdly, that the common laws of physics and gravity were set at naught by the practitioners of this science or art, in so far as they had the power of passing through small apertures, flying in the air, or floating on the surface of water, etc. We have counterparts, and more than counterparts, to these and other absurd tenets relative to the ancient science of witchcraft in the vaunted modern doctrines of homœopathy.

We have already made some quotations from Hahnemann and others (see p. 23), as to the belief which he himself and his followers maintain, that by the multiplied triturations and succussions which they employ in the preparation of their remedies, they evoke “*spiritual medicinal powers*” out of the crude substances or drugs which they thus treat. “The homœopathic system of medicine,” says Hahnemann, “develops for its use, to an unheard-of degree, the *spiritual medicinal powers* of the crude substances by means of a process peculiar to it.”—(*Organon*, p. 315.) And in another passage of his *Organon* he tells us, “that this *spiritual power* (of drugs), capable of altering man’s health, and hence of curing diseases, which lies hid in the inner nature of medicines, is not of itself discoverable by us, in any way, by the mere effort of reasoning.”—(P. 121.) “The homœopathic remedies,” says Broacke, “are merely stripped of their bodies, of their matter, that the ‘*spirit*’ only may be employed.”¹ “I believe,” says Dr Mure, the ‘Apostle of homœopathy,’ “that all substances in nature, even those regarded as most inert, possess the power of acting on the vital dynamism, because all contain a *spiritual principle*, which they derive from God.”²

In short, Hahnemann, and others of his school, have laid it down

¹ Broacke’s “Homœopathie Observations,” quoted in Dr Wood’s “Sequel,” p. 13.

² British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. vii. p. 535. Professor Playfair has left it on record, that Dr Horsely entertained this strange doctrine, that “every atom of matter has a soul.” Playfair’s Works, *Appendix*, p. 79. Weld’s *History of the Royal Society*, vol. ii., p. 168.

as one of their leading dogmas, that the continued shakings and triturations which homœopathists employ in the preparation of their dilutions, tinctures, etc., enabled them to separate and secure a "*spiritual* medicinal power" from the drugs on which they operated. The believers in witchcraft of a former age fancied that, by exercising particular conjurations and forms of words, it was possible for man to obtain for his use invisible spiritual sorceric powers, by the aid of which he could work at pleasure "weal or woe upon the bodies and minds of his fellow-men." The followers of Hahnemann of the present age in the same way fancy that, by exercising particular succussions and triturations, it is possible for man to obtain for his use (even out of matters supposed to be inert, as platinum, gold, charcoal), invisible spiritual medicinal powers, by the aid of which he can produce at pleasure the strangest effects upon the bodies or minds of his fellow-men. In proof of these effects, let the reader turn again to the list of mental delusions and bodily affections, which the homœopathists allege to be produced by their drugs, and some of which we have quoted in the preceding pages.¹

In obtaining spiritual influences to aid them in their work, the alleged capacity of the wizard and the homœopathist differs, however, it is proper to remark, in one respect. The practitioner of homœopathy evokes by triturations, succussions, etc., his "*spiritual*" powers, principles, or influences, out of material bodies, as house-salt, charcoal, oyster-shells, etc.; and then subsequently chains these powers down again for his use into material forms, dissolving them to form his tinctures, or compounding them with sugar of milk to form his globules, etc. The practitioner of witchcraft, on the contrary, evoked his "*spiritual*" powers, principles, or influences, from the world of disembodied spirits, or out of the spiritual and not out of the material world. But he was supposed also to have the power, like the homœopathist, of converting them subsequently into corporeal shapes, and, like him, of retaining them for his use under corporeal forms. Thus Reginald Scott, one of the most learned writers on witchcraft in the 17th century, sums up the established part of the old doctrine of that science, relative to this part, and relative to the powers and practice of witches, in the following formula:—"And now, forsooth, (says he,) it is brought to this point, that all devils which were wont

¹ See, for example, p. 76, 77; p. 72 and 73; and foot-notes, p. 30, and p. 48, 49.

to be *spiritual* may at their (the witches') pleasure become *corporeal*, and show themselves familiar to witehes and conjurers, and to none other; and by them only may be made tame, and kept in a Box."¹ It is unnecessary to state farther how perfectly analogous this is (*Box* and all included) to the opinion and practice of Hahnemann and his followers regarding the spiritual medicinal influences which they believe they can "develop" (to use their own term), and with which, forsooth, they imagine they can perform such wonderful effects on man.

The witch-burners of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries believed that witchcraft bestowed the property of animal transformations upon its votaries; and that those possessed of the required influence, had the power of appearing in the form of hares, wolves, cats, etc. But modern homœopathy has seriously and solemnly taught transformations far more marvellous. For Hahnemann and his strict followers in the itch doctrine (see page 24) so far virtually uphold that the itch insect (*Acarus Scabiei*), or its miasm, may appear both in the human mind and human body under the shape, attributes, and forms of many, many different species of disease; as Mania and Mumps, Hypochondriasis and Hysteria, Cancer and Cramps, Convulsions and Calculus, Asthma and Amaurosis, Dropsy and Deafness, Rickets and Bleeding from the nose, Palsy and Pains of innumerable kinds, etc., etc.; besides all which, it is this same insect which is the indirect or direct cause, according to Mr Everest, of Atheism, Bigotry, the Crusades, Mormonism, Agapemone, and a thousand other Sins and Crimes. (See, antecedently, p. 25). And the prevalent idea of the old witchfinders, detecting by peculiar witch-marks on the bodies of the accused, the infallible presence of "the markings of Satan," was surely not a whit more ridiculous and truthless than the modern idea of Hahnemann and his disciples, detecting by its peculiar signs in a hundred different chronic diseases, the infallible presence of the miasm of the *Acarus Scabiei*; or in other words, the astounding evolutions and escapades of that unhappy and mischievous insect, the feats and freaks of this microscopic entomological "spirit of evil."

According to the doctrines of witchcraft, the possessed had so far some of the simplest and the best established laws of physics set

¹ Scott's Discovery of Witchcraft. Letter to Sir Roger Mannwood, p. 3.

the Act of Queen Mary till the accession of James to the throne of England, the average number of executions for witchcraft in Scotland, a period of thirty-nine years, was two hundred annually, or seventeen thousand altogether.”¹

The belief in witchcraft affected society far more deeply than ever homœopathy has done, or is ever at all likely to do. On the Continent, it found enthusiastic disciples among Popes and Kings, Princes and Priests; and, in fact, the populations² of whole kingdoms ardently adopted it. In England there were sincere believers in it from that royal writer on demonology, King James, down to the most venerable judge upon the judicial bench, Sir Matthew Hale, and that most intelligent of English physicians, Sir Thomas Browne. “The highest ranks,” says Dr Mackay, “shared and encouraged the delusion.” As in most other analogous delusions, women were among its most enthusiastic votaries; and too often its victims. The wise King James offers as his royal explanation (whether correctly or not we may not disloyally inquire) why there were twenty women devoted to the practice of witchcraft for every one man, that “as that sexe is frailer than man is, so is it (the female sex) easier to be entrapped in these grosse snares.” But the principal promoters of the belief in witchcraft, as in most other analogous delusions and quackeries, proved to be the clergy. Thus, in one of the last witch trials in Scotland (and which resulted in the burning of five poor women at Paisley, upon the false and foolish accusation of a child of eleven years of age), Law specially tells us that, among the persons chiefly to blame for this fearful judicial murder, were “certain ministers of too much forwardness and absurd credulity.” The nature of the clerical education is perhaps the reason of this discreditable characteristic; but be the explanation what it may, it proves only too true still, that (like witchcraft, sorcery, etc., in olden times) mesmerism, clairvoyance, homœopathy, and the like delusions of modern times, have in various parts of the kingdom their principal or sole supporters in the clergymen of the district, to the frequent loss of their own proper and legitimate clerical influence with rational and sound minds in the successful discharge of those far higher duties

¹ Popular Delusion, vol. ii. p. 135.

² “There was not,” says Dr Henry, when treating of our manners in the fifteenth century, “there was not a man then in England who entertained the least doubt of the reality of Sorcery, Necromancy, and other diabolical arts.”—*History of Great Britain*, vol. ii. p. 543.

and far mightier truths which have been entrusted to their special teaching and care.

Many homœopathists, however, argue, that medical men ought to leave out of view all secondary considerations connected with homœopathy;—they ought to drop out of sight, Hahnemann's doctrine of itch miasm as the cause of "seven-eighths of all chronic diseases"—his doctrine of infinitesimal doses—his doctrine of spiritual medicinal influences, etc. etc., as mere subsidiary articles in the homœopathic creed, and articles to which all his followers do not implicitly subscribe; and further, they aver that, in considering the value and character of homœopathy, physicians ought to look alone to Hahnemann's one grand discovery and great ruling tenet or dogma, *similia similibus curantur*, "like is cured by like," as the sole vital part of his peculiar medical system. Thus, to quote Dr Scott, one of the most learned of the homœopathic writers, "the essential characteristic of the homœopathic school is singly and simply the adoption of a *law of treatment applicable to ALL forms of disease*, expressed by the words, *SIMILIA SIMILIBUS CURANTUR*; this," he adds, "we conceive to be the whole distinctive creed."¹

In the remaining chapters, therefore, we will principally confine our attention to this so-called law, and consider the grounds upon which Hahnemann averred its truth, as founded on analogy, and on the method pursued by nature in her own successful cures of diseases; the extent of similarity which Hahnemann required for its fulfilment; the effects on medical practice and theory to which this doctrine of *similia similibus curantur* tends to lead; whether this averred universal law of therapeutics is not disproved by considering the effects of our best known remedies upon some of our best known diseases, etc. Before doing so, let me merely observe, in concluding the present chapter, that, even in relation to this fundamental law of *similia similibus*, the modern theory and practice of homœopathy finds again in this, as in the instances² which I have already cited, its "*similar*"

¹ British Journal of Homœopathy for 1850, p. 289.

² "Witches themselves (observes Lord Bacon) are imaginative, and believe oftentimes they do that which they do not." It is perhaps superfluous to remark how exactly Lord Bacon's remark applies to homœopathists. Nor is a late observation by Dr Mayo, upon one of the marvels in the history of the practitioners of witchcraft, less true in reference to the history of the practitioners of homœopathy. "*The marvel in witchcraft (says Dr Mayo), is the belief entertained by the sorcerers and witches themselves of its reality. That many of these persons, shrewd and unprincipled, should have pretended an implicit belief in their art, is only what is occasionally done in*

in the ancient practice and science of witchcraft. For when the olden practitioners of witchcraft wished to influence a person, they always formed, as is well known, an artificial likeness or image (*simile*) of the special individual whom they wished to remove or destroy; just as the present practitioners of homœopathy declare that they always form in the system an artificial likeness or image (*simile*) of the special disease which they wish to remove or destroy. "The way (says Balgrave) which the witches usually take for to afflict man or beaste in this kind, is done by Image or Model, made in the *likeness* of that man or beaste they intend to work mischief upon."¹ And by injuring with pins, needles, fire, or otherwise, any part or organ of this image, as the limb, liver, etc., the same part or organ in the devoted individual was supposed to suffer correspondingly;—a kind of belief in *similia similibus delentur* as old as the days of Ovid:—

"Devovet absentes, simulacraque cerea figit,
Et miserum tenues in jecur urget acus."

modern times. But that they should, as it is proved by some of their confessions previously to execution, have been their own dupes, and have entertained no doubt whatsoever of the reality of their intercourse with the devil, is surprising enough."—*Popular Superstitions*, p. 131.

¹ Astrological Practice of Physick, p. 89. See also King James' Dæmonology, Book ii., Chap. 5, etc. etc. Such images were also used for medical purposes by the exorcists. Thus Pizzurnus advises a wax image or *simile* of the patient, to be made by the physician, and the organ or part in the image to be burnt, which corresponds to the diseased organ or part in the invalid; believing that the destruction of the diseased part in the image will secure the destruction of the disease in the same part of the invalid.—See the *Enchiridion Exorcisticum*, p. 54.

CHAPTER XV.

ON THE LAW OF HOMŒOPATHY AS EXHIBITED BY NATURE IN THE PHYSICAL WORLD, AND IN THE CURATIVE EFFECTS OF SIMILAR DISEASES UPON EACH OTHER; HAHNEMANN'S ILLUSTRATIONS FROM SMALL-POX AND MEASLES; EXPOSI- TION OF THESE ILLUSTRATIONS.

MEDICAL men are often roundly blamed by the partisans of particular systems of medical charlatanry, for not bestowing upon the particular system or systems, which these partisans happen to patronise, an appropriate share of study and consideration. But the task would be as endless—as useless—if the legitimate physician had to lay aside his legitimate studies in order to take time to direct his attention to every form of temporary charlatanry that chanced to spring up. As justly might it be argued, that the clergyman is blameable for not laying aside his Bible and ecclesiastical duties, and bestowing upon the innumerable forms of religious creeds and alleged revelations that at present prevail in the world, or that may from time to time be propounded, the degree of study and consideration which the favourers of each of these special delusions may deem necessary. “Have you ever looked into homœopathy?—have you ever read Hahnemann’s *Organon*?—said an eminent divine to an equally eminent physician. ‘No;’ replied the physician, ‘and let me ask you, in return, if you have read the Mormon Bible?’ The clergyman, of course, answered in the negative; and his medical friend said to him very properly, ‘When you take the trouble to examine Joe Smith’s Bible, I will take the trouble to examine Hahnemann’s *Organon*.’ ”¹

The “*Organon*” of Hahnemann, the work alluded to in the above anecdote, is, as I have said in a preceding page (p. 2), “the principal and standard work on the subject” of homœopathy; and hence

¹ Dr Hooker’s *Physician and Patient*, p. 215.

it is the volume to which, throughout the present essay, I have principally referred when citing the standard opinions of Hahnemann. Dr Dudgeon, of London, in publishing in 1849 an English translation of the last edition of it, prefaces the book by announcing it as, "The immortal work that contains the *full* exposition of that glorious and beneficent system of medicine—homœopathy." "Every page of it," he states, "abounds in profound and original thought;" and the last or fifth German edition, the one which, as I have said, he translated, from which we have always quoted in this essay, "contains the principles of his doctrine in their *most perfect and matured state*."

In this work, Hahnemann, amongst other numerous matters and tenets, explains some of the foundations upon which he bases his "unerring law" of homœopathy *similia similibus curantur*. One of these foundations, if it may be called so, consists of analogical evidence from phenomena in the physical and moral world. A second, and far more important foundation, consists in the allegation, that homœopathy is the mode of cure which Nature herself follows in the successful treatment of diseases. Let us consider briefly the statements which he makes under each of these heads:—

1. *Analogical evidence in favour of Homœopathy from the study of Physical Phenomena.*

"A weaker dynamic affection is (says Hahnemann) permanently extinguished in the living organism by a stronger one, if the latter, whilst differing in kind, is similar to the former in its manifestations."

"Thus (Hahnemann adds) are cured both physical affections and moral maladies. How is it that in the early dawn the brilliant Jupiter vanishes from the gaze of the beholder? By a stronger, very similar, power acting on his optic nerve—the brightness of approaching day! In situations replete with fœtid odours, wherewith is it usual to soothe effectually the offended olfactory nerves? With snuff, that affects the sense of smell in a similar, but stronger, manner! No music, no sugared cake, which act on the nerves of other senses, can cure this nausea caused by the disgusting odour. How does the warrior cunningly banish the piteous cries of him who runs the gauntlet from the ears of the compassionate bystanders? By the shrill notes of the fife, commingled with the roll of the noisy drum! And the distant roar of the enemy's cannon, that inspires his army with fear? By the mimic thunder of the big drum! For neither the one nor the other would the distribution of a brilliant piece of uniform, nor a reprimand to the regiment, suffice. In like manner, mourning and sorrow will be effaced from the mind, by the account of another and still greater cause for sorrow happening to another, even though it be a mere fiction. The injurious consequences of too great joy will be removed by drinking coffee, which produces

an excessively joyous state of mind. Nations, like the Germans, who have for centuries been gradually sinking deeper and deeper in soulless apathy and degrading serfdom, must first be trodden still deeper in the dust by the Western Conqueror, until their situations became intolerable; their mean opinion of themselves was thereby overstrained and removed; they again became alive to their dignity as men, and then, for the first time, they raised their heads as Germans.”—(*Organon*, p. 126.)

It is difficult to comment, with due gravity, upon reasoning so rampant and ridiculous as the above; and yet some of the more easily deluded of the disciples of Hahnemann, not only look upon these analogical proofs of the truth of homœopathy as very philosophic, but cite them with earnest eagerness as evidence to that effect. But to what does this analogical reasoning amount? Its intense innate folly may perhaps be best seen by simply adducing a specimen of the conclusions to which such homœopathic physics would lead. If there is any truth in Hahnemann's allegations, it necessarily follows, as pointed out by Dr Currie, “That when the eye is pained by gazing at a glittering object or a bright artificial light, we have but to gaze upwards for a while at the sun in order to relieve the suffering organ of vision. When offended with disagreeable emanations, we have but to cause a sufficient quantity of sulphuretted hydrogen to be eliminated to remove all annoyance of the kind; and when alarm is caused by the firing of a pistol, it will be at once removed by firing off a piece of ordnance. The idea of military drums being intended to drown the roar of the artillery, and thereby prevent the soldiers from getting frightened, is a capital illustration of Hahnemann's reasoning as to cause and effect. The next illustration argues only a demoniacal mind, if it be given as the result of experience; extreme ignorance of the phenomena of mind, if only a theory. Truly there must be great hope for the poor oppressed sons of Africa, if there be any shadow of foundation for the last of these illustrations of the *lucidum per obscurum*.”¹

But it is, I believe, quite needless to dwell upon these indefensible analogies of Hahnemann in favour of homœopathy. The more rational among his own admirers and followers confess them to be simply ridiculous. “We may,” observes an editorial critic, in one of the last Numbers of the “British Homœopathic Journal,” “we may, and do admit, that almost all the *analogies* Hahnemann has adduced, in illustration of his therapeutic principle, from the phy-

¹ Dublin Quarterly Journal, vol. i., 1846, p. 193.

sical and moral world, are unhappy. We have ere now frequently exposed their fallacy.”—(*British Journal of Homœopathy* for 1852, p. 471.)

The other allegation of Hahnemann, that the principle of *similia similibus curantur* is the curative principle which Nature herself follows in her own occasional successful treatment of diseases, is a proposition, the importance of which demands for it a more lengthened examination.

2. *Alleged evidence in favour of Homœopathy from the study of the mode in which NATURE removes the Diseases of the body by the curative agency of other SIMILAR diseases.*

In various parts of his “Organon,” Hahnemann anxiously attempts to show that the law of homœopathy (*similia similibus curantur*) is the law of cure which Nature herself follows when she is successful in removing one disease by the occurrence of another. In other words, Hahnemann roundly and repeatedly avers, that the alleged universal law of cure which he supposed he had discovered—“like is cured by like”—was a law exemplified by Nature in her curative removal of one similar disease by the supervention of another. He earnestly insists upon this pathological or rather therapeutical point as a natural groundwork, and great argument for the truth of his supposed universal law of artificial cure. Speaking of the alleged cure or removal of a previous disease in the body by the accidental supervention of any *similar* disease, he observes, “We can point to some beautiful homœopathic cures effected by this lucky concurrence, all so many INCONTROVERTIBLE proofs of the great, the sole therapeutic law of nature that obtains in them—*cure by similarity of symptoms*.”¹ “When two *similar* diseases (as he again states it) meet together in the same body, that is to say, when to the disease already present a stronger similar one is added, we see how a cure CAN be effected by the operations of Nature, and we get a LESSON as to how *we* ought to cure;”² for the physician is in this way taught “what kind of artificial morbid potency (or medicine) he ought to choose, in order to cure in a sure, rapid, and permanent manner, agreeably to the process that takes place in nature.”³ “ALL (he avers) the rapid and perfect cures that Nature ever performed, were always effected by

¹ Organon, p. 153.

² *Ib.*, p. 145.

³ *Ib.*, p. 151.

the supervention upon the old disease of one of a *similar* character.”¹ And hence he argues elsewhere, that “for this mode of procedure (by homœopathy) we have the example of unfettered NATURE HERSELF, when to an old disease there is added a new one similar to the first, whereby the one is rapidly and for ever annihilated and cured.”²

Elsewhere he systematises the same proposition into the following broad and sweeping statement:—“INVARIABLY (says Hahnemann) and in every case, do two diseases, differing certainly in kind, but very *similar* in their phenomena and effects, and in the sufferings and symptoms they severally produce, ANNIHILATE ONE ANOTHER, whenever they meet in the organism; the stronger disease, namely, annihilates the weaker.”³

“I might (alleges Hahnemann) adduce many examples of diseases which, in the course of Nature, have been homœopathically cured by other diseases with similar symptoms;” but, as he wishes only “to speak about something determinate and indubitable,” he “confines” his illustration of the preceding tenet—regarding the invariable annihilation of one similar disease by the supervention of another—to adducing the curative effects of two diseases, Small-pox and measles, upon other similar affections. It would be nought but a waste of time and patience to expose and refute all the trifling and irrelevant examples which Hahnemann gives in supposed illustration of the homœopathic curative effects of these two diseases. But let us consider one or two of his own most positive and prominent examples. And I take first, the example upon which he and other homœopaths have, I believe, principally insisted as an illustration of the “*invariable*,” “*eternal law of nature*,” that a stronger similar disease annihilates a weaker. This alleged example is the following, viz. :—that small-pox (as a remedy) will, by its similarity of symptoms, immediately remove cow-pox (as a disease) when either artificially or accidentally the small-pox (as a homœopathic remedy) attacks the body at the time it is affected with the cow-pox (as a disease).

Hahnemann states this homœopathic curative effect of small-pox upon the similar affection cow-pox, in the following words:—

“*Small-pox coming on after vaccination, as well on account of its greater strength as its great similarity, IMMEDIATELY REMOVES ENTIRELY the Cow-pox homœopathically, and does not permit it to come*

to maturity ; but, on the other hand, the Cow-pox when near maturity does, on account of its great similarity, homœopathically diminish very much the supervening Small-pox, and make it much milder, as Mühry (in Robert Willan, on "Vaccination"¹) and many others testify."²

Now, let us inquire what degree of truth there is in this alleged illustration by Hahnemann of the "invariable" homœopathic law of the *similia similibus curantur*, as taken from the effects of one similar disease upon the removal of another similar disease ; and whether this is, as he styles it, "the only therapeutic law consonant to nature."

And, first, let me observe, that in the above paragraph Hahnemann refers as his authority to Mühry in "Dr Willan on Vaccination." In the celebrated work of Willan, to which Hahnemann refers, I do not find the name of Dr Mühry.³ And, on the other hand, the facts and deductions, in Dr Willan's work, are totally and flatly opposed to the alleged illustration of homœopathy from that work, as stated in the first part of Hahnemann's paragraph.

Secondly, The latter or concluding half of the preceding paragraph of Hahnemann's, contains reference to a circumstance which bears little or indeed nothing upon the question at issue, and therefore scarcely deserves consideration. Mr Bryce, of Edinburgh, long ago showed that after a person was vaccinated, and the cow-pox vesicle was developed as far as the fifth or sixth day, if the other arm of that same person were then vaccinated, this second vaccine vesicle ran its course very rapidly, so as to terminate at, or nearly at the same time as that upon the other arm ; and the original idea of this "*test-pock*" in cow-pox inoculation was derived

¹ Organon, p. 148.

² As other examples of homœopathic cures by attacks of small-pox of previously existing similar affections, Hahnemann adduces from authors single cases of the removal of ophthalmia, amaurosis, deafness and dyspnœa, swelling of the testicle, and dysentery by natural or inoculated variola. In a subsequent chapter, we shall have occasion to consider whether these are really true examples of the "great, sole therapeutic law of Nature—cure by *similarity* of symptoms."

³ It is, however, possible, that though Mühry's name does not occur in the English edition of Willan's work, it may be found in connection with translations of the work into French or German. I am not aware whether this essay of Willan was ever translated into any of these languages.

by Mr Bryce from seeing some similar phenomena in small-pox inoculation. In the same way, when a person has a cow-pox vesicle upon the arm several days old, and small-pox appears, the small-pox is, in a similar manner, diminished in its intensity and hurried on in its course. And M. Bosquet has pointed out that the same is sometimes seen when the patient, after having the small-pox broken out, is vaccinated, the cow-pox in such a case, when it holds, running the short course of the test-pock of Mr Bryce. In other words, a person constitutionally affected with cow-pox, from the vesicle upon his arm having progressed so far as to affect the system, has already his economy so changed by it, as to diminish the intensity of either cow-pox or of small-pox, if either of these be set in action at that time in the body. This reflex kind of action, however, of the disease (cow-pox) upon the remedy (small-pox), or of small-pox upon cow-pox, has no bearing upon the homœopathic question of the alleged extinction or annihilation of the cow-pox by the small-pox. For,—

Thirdly, It is the first part of Hahnemann's paragraph that is specially important as an illustration of Hahnemann's supposed "eternal, infallible law," that a weaker disease is permanently annihilated in the living body, by a stronger disease, provided the second, or stronger disease, is SIMILAR to the first but *weaker* in its manifestations and symptoms. "Hence (says he) small-pox coming on after vaccination, as well on account of its greater strength as its great similarity, IMMEDIATELY REMOVES ENTIRELY the cow-pox homœopathically, and does not permit it to come to maturity."¹

The author, Dr Willan, to whose work we have found Hahnemann in the preceding paragraph so imprudently referring, is, it will be universally granted, perhaps the very greatest authority that could be adduced upon any point connected with eruptive diseases. But, as I have already hinted, Willan states the matter very differently indeed from Hahnemann, and very differently from what Hahnemann's "invariable" law requires. As early as the year 1800, Dr Willan laid down the following propositions, as the result of his observations regarding the artificial inoculation, at or nearly at the same time, of the same person with small-pox and cow-pox,—a proceeding

¹ Organon, p. 148.

which, let me remark in passing, was often adopted for various reasons, when cow-pox inoculation was first introduced.

1. "That when a person was inoculated with vaccine and variolous matter *about the same time*, both inoculations proved effective ; for the VACCINE VESICLE PROCEEDED TO ITS ACME in the usual number of days, and the maturation of the variolous pustule was attended with a pustular eruption on the skin.

2. "That these effects took place, without much variation, in all cases where the interval between the two inoculations *did not exceed a week* ; but,

3. "That when variolous matter was inserted on the *ninth* day after the vaccine inoculation, its action seemed to be wholly precluded," (the system being now sufficiently fortified against it by the due protecting effects of cow-pox).¹

The result of several years' further observations on this point, led Dr Willan to conclude that, "The variolous and vaccine virus inoculated at the *same* time restrain the operation of each other on the body, and somewhat alter the form of the pustules or vesicles, *without* effecting any change in the QUALITIES of the fluid they contain," or preventing each going on to maturation. And to prove that the two diseases can and do go on in the constitution at the same time, to full maturation, he adds, "that fluid taken from the vaccine vesicle on the arm of a person affected with the variolous fever and eruption, and inserted into the arm of another person by a clean lancet, produced the vaccine disease alone ;" while in the same cases the variolous pustules were also capable by inoculation of communicating small-pox to those into whose skin the matter from those pustules was inoculated.¹ In other words, the two diseases, small-pox and cow-pox, continue to progress together in the same constitution ; and, consequently, Dr Willan did NOT, as Hahnemann avers, find it true that small-pox coming on after vaccination, "*immediately removes entirely* the cow-pox homœopathically, and does not permit it to come to maturity." Dr Willan found the very contrary to be the fact.²

¹ Dr Willan on Vaccine Inoculation, p. 3.

² Ibid., p. 6.

Dr Willan gives a drawing and notice of a case of the conjunction of small-pox and cow-pox upon the same individual, which is peculiarly interesting, as bearing upon the homœopathic law. He represents in his work, Plate I., Fig. 3, the arm of a boy who had been inoculated with variolous matter so long as ten days before vaccination. The vaccine vesicle progressed, and is represented of full size; and *within* the border of one side of the vaccine vesicle is a small-pox pustule, which rose and matured in that unusual position. Matter taken from this enclosed small-pox pustule communicated, Dr Willan further states, the small-pox; while the matter taken from the vaccine portion of the vesicle, communicated the cow-pox, showing that the vaccinia had also matured. The drawing of this case, as published by Dr Willan, is in itself a strong pictorial protest against the truth of the great "unerring infallible law" of homœopathy. For it represents not only the small-pox unable to overcome and annihilate (as it homœopathically *ought* to do) the cow-pox upon the same individual; but it shows it to be unable to do so even when the small-pox pustule is developed in the very same portion of skin as the cow-pox pustule. "Invariably," says Hahnemann, "and in every case, do two diseases, differing certainly in kind, but very similar in their phenomena and effects, annihilate one another whenever they meet together in the organism; because the stronger morbid potency, when it appears, does, on account of its similarity of action, INVOLVE EXACTLY THE SAME PARTS of the organism that were hitherto affected by the weaker morbid irritation, which consequently can no longer influence the system, but is extinguished; or (in other words) because, whenever the vital force, deranged by the primary disease, is attacked by the new, very similar, but stronger, dynamic morbid potency, it therefore remains affected by the latter alone, whereby the former similar, but weaker disease, must, as a mere dynamic power without material substratum, cease to exercise any further morbid influence on the vital force, consequently it must cease to exist."¹ In the instance to which I refer, the small-pox, or stronger morbid power, as Hahnemann declares it to be, did not extinguish the weaker morbid power of the cow-pox, even though situated in the same structure, and though developed in identically and precisely the same limited spot of skin as the disease, which, homœopathically, it ought

¹ Organon, p. 145.

at once to have entirely removed and annihilated. It would be difficult, I believe, or impossible, to devise or suggest a pathological experiment of a more crucial character than this case of Willan's accidentally affords, to determine and fix the truth or truthlessness of the homœopathic law, *similia similibus curantur*. And the evidence which the case offers in direct and deliberate contradiction of that law, is too conclusive and too convincing to require any more lengthened comment.

Since Willan's time, cases of the simultaneous existence of small-pox and cow-pox have not been seen so frequently, because small-pox is not now spread by inoculation. At the present day the inoculation of small-pox is prohibited by law in England. But numbers of cases have been recorded of the inoculated cow-pox, and accidental small-pox, going on simultaneously upon the cutaneous surface of the same patient; and most practitioners have seen such cases.

M. Legendre has collected, from various authorities, above fifty, and Clerault above one hundred, cases of the simultaneous appearance of those two diseases. The phenomena are more various than under the combination of *inoculated* small-pox and cow-pox; for the state of the system during the stage of incubation, in accidental or spontaneous small-pox, appears sometimes to modify and influence the result. But the most severe or "strongest" form of accidental small-pox, if it supervene upon cow-pox, does not, as a general rule, remove or annihilate the latter. When the small-pox is even of the most fatal type, still it does not "remove," "annihilate," or indeed interfere at all, with the progress of the vaccine pustule. In an epidemic at Marseilles in 1828, sixteen persons died, all affected with co-existent cow-pox and small-pox. A case has been reported by Richard, of the small-pox proving fatal at the time when the cow-pox pustule was in full course, vaccination having been performed eight days previously. The same author reports another case, in which he observed, as had been often remarked before, the two eruptions progress side by side unmodified by each other (*les deux eruptions ont marché a coté l'une de l'autre dans la meilleure intelligence, et de la maniere le plus heureuse*).¹

M. Bosquet, the latest, and perhaps the highest, French authority on the subjects of cow-pox and small-pox, states, as the result of much

¹ *Nouveau Traite de la Vaccine et des Eruptions Varioleuses* (1848), p. 203.

study of this subject, that the facts recorded by others, and observed by himself, seem to show,—1. That when small-pox and cow-pox appear together on the body at the same time, or within two or three days of each other, each follows its own natural progress, unmodified by the other; and that, whether the cow-pox or small-pox first appears. 2. That the ease is different when either of these two eruptions has a *longer* period of precedence of the other, for then the disease which appears last, whether the small-pox or cow-pox, is modified and abridged in its course; whilst the affection, which had first broken out, does not undergo the least deviation from its normal form and duration (*la plus avancée conserve tous ses avantages et finit à son heure ordinaire, sans éprouver le moindre dérangement ni dans sa forme, ni dans sa durée, p. 218*).¹

These facts, regarding the mutual influence of small-pox and cow-pox, and their concurrence on the body of the same patient, are utterly opposed to, and subversive of, Hahnemann's inferences. For what Hahnemann averred to be "INVARIABLY" true—and what the necessities of his alleged law, *similia similibus curantur*, required to be invariably true,—is not true; the "stronger disease" (small-pox) does NOT, as he maintained, annihilate the "weaker disease" (cow-pox) when the small-pox comes on after vaccination. It does NOT "*immediately remove entirely* the cow-pox," as he averred; and generally it does not even interfere at all with the progress and maturation of cow-pox, when it comes on after it. And more, the very authority, Dr Willan, to whose work Hahnemann unscrupulously refers his credulous readers in support of his views, gives facts and conclusions most flatly and avowedly contradictory of these very views.

But turning from such apocryphal homœopathic effects of *Small-pox*, let us consider the alleged homœopathic effect of the other disease which Hahnemann adduces in illustration, viz., *Measles*. The

¹ The same authority gives the following general conclusions:— "Contentons-nous de remarquer ici que, dans ces sortes d'influence de la vaccine sur la variole et de la variole sur la vaccine, il n'y a rien de direct, rien d'actif, rien de spécial; c'est la suite, c'est la conséquence de la propriété qu'elles ont de se suppléer, de se substituer l'une à l'autre. La vaccine n'arrête pas la variole, c'est la variole qui s'arrête devant la vaccine; et réciproquement, la variole ne tranche pas brusquement le cours de la vaccine c'est la vaccine qui s'interrompt en face de la variole. C'est un droit de *préséance*; et cela est si vrai, que plus elles s'éloignent, plus promptement elles se donnent l'exclusion; plus elles se rapprochent, plus elles ont de liberté et d'indépendance."—Bosquet, p. 219.

first and principal illustration which he gives of the homœopathic therapeutic effect of measles is as follows :—

*“ The Measles (says he) bears a strong resemblance in the character of its fever and cough to the Hooping-cough, and hence it was that Bosquillon noticed, in an epidemic where both these affections prevailed, that many children who then took Measles remained free from Hooping-cough during that epidemic. They would all have been protected from, and rendered incapable of, being infected by the Hooping-cough in that and all subsequent epidemics, by the Measles, if the Hooping-cough were not a disease that has only a partial similarity to the Measles ; that is to say, if it had also a cutaneous eruption similar to what the latter possesses. As it is, however, the Measles can but preserve a large number from Hooping-cough, and that only in the epidemic prevailing at the time.”*¹

In reference to the above grave and strong statement, let me first observe, that every physician,² and many a nurse and mother, can bear ample testimony, from their own experience, to the fact that the previous occurrence of measles does NOT prevent an attack of hooping-cough ; not even when they prevail epidemically, as they sometimes do, in the same locality at the same time. But Hahnemann adduces as his authority for the truth of his assertion, the evidence of a distinguished French physician, Bosquillon, the translator of the works of Cullen. Unfortunately, however, for Hahnemann's

¹ Organon, p. 150.

² Many of our medical writers mention the fact incidentally. Thus the most learned of modern authors, Dr Copland, tells us, in his “ Dictionary of Medicine,” that Hooping-cough or “ pertussis, in either an epidemic or sporadic form, particularly the former, sometimes follows rapidly upon Measles. Occasionally (he adds) it appears during convalescence from that complaint” (vol. ii. p. 237.) Desruelles, in his Treatise on Hooping-Cough, observes, “ Il n'est pas rare de voir la rougeole, la scarlatine, et même la variole se manifester pendant le cours de la Coqueluche, on être suivies de cette maladie.”—(*Traité de la Coqueluche*, p. 170.) One of our best modern authorities on the diseases of children, Dr West, believes an attack of the one disease predisposes to, instead of prevents, an attack of the other. “ My belief (observes Dr West) is, that the occurrence of any one of these diseases (hooping-cough, measles, and chicken-pox) during the epidemic prevalence of another, increases the liability of the child to become affected by that which is epidemic ; and that an exacerbation of the fever of hooping-cough, and the appearance of more serious illness than the local symptoms account for, is very likely to be due to the approach either of measles or chicken-pox.”—*Diseases of Infancy and Childhood*, p. 272.

veracity, the author he thus refers to as his authority in the matter (exactly as in the preceding case of Willan), does not state what Hahnemann alleges he states. Bosquillon's remark is to the following effect :—

“La nature de la contagion qui produit la Coqueluche, est inconnue. On a observé que les Rougeoles épidémiques précédoient souvent cette maladie. D'où l'on pouvoit croire qu'elle a, de même que la matiere de la Rougeole, une attraction particuliere avec les glandes muqueuses, et que ces deux maladies ont quelque affinité. Elles sont cependant indépendantes l'une de l'autre, et la contagion est différente; car on a vu beaucoup de personnes qui avaient été attaqués de la Rougeole, éviter la Coqueluche, et d'autres gagner cette dernière quoiqu' elles eussent eu autrefois la Rougeole; ce qui prouve que la génération de la matiere morbifique varie dans ces deux maladies.”

For these observations of Bosquillon, taken from his French Edition of Cullen's Practice of Medicine—at the part and chapter referred to in a foot-note by Hahnemann—(viz., “Part II. 1-3, chap. vii.”), I am indebted to my late friend Dr William Thomson, Professor of the Practice of Physic in the University of Glasgow, to whom I applied, knowing that he had a copy of Bosquillon's Cullen in his possession. As to Hahnemann's tactics in this instance, I beg to give simply the comments on them contained in the letter from Dr Thomson, which enclosed the preceding extract.

“I have copied (says Dr Thomson) the passage from Bosquillon's notes to Cullen to which you refer, on the back of Hahnemann's strange gloss of it, which you sent to me. A perusal of it will satisfy you that the text and the commentary are as far apart as east from west. Many people, says Bosquillon, have first measles and afterwards hooping-cough, which seems to indicate some connection between the two diseases; but as many who take measles have not hooping-cough afterwards, and many take hooping-cough after a considerable interval of time since they had measles, it would appear that the connection is not so close as from the first set of cases referred to, might be inferred. So far from supposing any preventive power, Bosquillon thought there was some ground for thinking that measles *prepares* the way for hooping-cough, and that that preparatory influence is exercised through the mucous glands.” “I have further compared (adds Dr Thomson) Bosquillon's own note with the German translation, and they quite correspond; so that there is no loophole for escape in that direction.”

The preceding instances of cure of similar diseases by small-pox and measles are, observes Hahnemann, "all so many INCONTROVERTIBLE PROOFS of the great, the sole therapeutic law of nature that obtains in them: *Cure by similarity of symptoms*. By (such) instances (he continues) this therapeutic law is rendered obvious to ALL intelligent minds."¹

On the contrary, the preceding illustrations will, I believe, be deemed by all intelligent minds quite sufficient, without further comment, to show the utter groundlessness of the leading special data derived from the cure of diseases by nature, upon which Hahnemann, in the body of his "*Organon*," professedly grounds his law of *similia similibus curantur*; and at the same time they too sadly illustrate the utter recklessness with which he could quietly pervert the facts recorded in medicine when such an alteration was necessary for the purpose of homœopathy.

For here we find him daringly making facts out of books to ground and base his "infallible and unerring" homœopathic law upon; and that too with even less hesitation and scrupulosity than we have already, in a preceding chapter, found some of his modern disciples making facts out of the magnetoscope with the view of proving by them *visibly*, the truth of the same law.

"They drew aside the veil, and where they were taught to expect a mystery, they discerned a fraud." Such is the motto, from Robert Hall, which Mr Brodribb has affixed to a late pamphlet on Homœopathy. And though the language is strong, it applies, I fear, only too truly to such painful disclosures as we have given in the present chapter on Hahnemannism.

¹ *Organon*, p. 153.

CHAPTER XVI.

AMOUNT OF SIMILARITY REQUIRED BY THE HOMŒOPATHIC LAW ; CONTRADICTION OF THE LAW IN HAHNEMANN'S OWN INSTANCES ; SUCCEEDS WHEN IT SHOULD FAIL ; FAILS WHEN IT SHOULD SUCCEED.

"CAN you doubt," writes a Reverend defender of homœopathy, "whose hand it was that stamped creation with the indelible words, *like cures like*?" "The law of God (says he) comes out in bold relief, '*Like shall be cured by Like.*'"¹

In accordance with this divine law (as others besides Mr Everest have irreverently termed it), a weaker disease ought always to be perfectly and permanently extinguished in the living organism by a supervening stronger disease, which, whilst differing in kind, was *similar* to the first or pre-existing disease in its manifestations or symptoms. Hahnemann has adduced in his *Organon* several individual examples to demonstrate this alleged homœopathic law. Fortunately these instances adduced by Hahnemann, are not examples of diseases removed by the use of so-called similar *medicines*; for, then, the mere fact of the medicines being at all similar in their symptoms to the disease, might have admitted of grave doubt and dispute, since, as we have already seen in chapter X., the alleged "provings" of the medicines themselves are in general too ambiguous and foundationless in their characters to admit of any reasoning being founded upon them. The examples, however, which he gives of weaker diseases being removed, in accordance with the fundamental homœopathic law, by the supervention of other stronger but similar diseases, affords a form of evidence admitting of far more satisfactory examination; and more particularly when these diseases happen to be *visible* affections, like the cutaneous eruptions. We have examined at some length, in the last chapter, the two principal

¹ Letter to Dr Cormack, by the Rev. T. R. Everest, 21.

instances which Hahnemann has himself selected and adduced from Nature to prove that homœopathy, or the principle of *similia similibus curantur*, is “a mode of cure founded on an eternal and infallible law of Nature.” These two alleged instances and proofs of this law, viz., an attack of small-pox immediately and entirely removing cow-pox, and measles being prevented by hooping-cough, are, as we have seen in the last chapter, mere assertions and not facts;—his own selected instances, when properly investigated, affording the strongest evidence against the truth of his alleged “eternal law” instead of affording the required evidence in favour of its truth. In the present chapter let us view the subject from another point, and inquire whether this alleged great “infallible law” of cure by similarity, may or may not be further equally disproved by considering the *amount* of similarity required for its success in some instances, and leading to its want of success in other examples.

In laying down the therapeutic law, *similia similibus curantur*, as a general, or rather an universal, law of cure, Hahnemann has omitted, as far as I know, to offer us anywhere a definition of the exact degree or kind, or amount of similarity, which he deemed requisite, in order that his law may be practically and successfully fulfilled; nor has he, on the other hand, anywhere estimated the degree of want of similarity that would lead to its failure. We know from various parts of his writings, that he maintained, that the remedy and the disease should not be the *same* in their symptoms.¹ For he denied the isopathic law of Luz, “*equalia equalibus curantur*.” But while he maintained that the symptoms of the remedial agent should be similar to, though not identical with, those of the disease, he has not laid down how few or how many of the symptoms of the original disease the homœopathic curative agent should possess, in order that a cure might be accomplished. He has, however, repeatedly and forcibly stated it in the *Organon* as his dominant proposition on the subject, that the artificial symptoms excited by the remedy should not only be “*similar*,”² but consist of “*an accurate similarity of symptoms*,”³ be “*the most similar possible*,”⁴ or “*as similar as possible*,”⁵ to those of the natural disease. “In order,” says he, that “the artificial diseases producible by medicines, may effect a cure, it is before all things requisite, that they should

¹ Lesser Writings, p. 708, etc.

² See *Organon*, pp. 100, and 108.

³ *Ib.* p. 127. “Similar; best if *very* similar.”—See his Lesser Writings, p. 705.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 230.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 133.

be capable of producing in the human body *an artificial disease AS SIMILAR AS POSSIBLE* to the disease to be cured, in order, by means of this similarity, conjoined with the somewhat greater strength, to substitute themselves for the natural morbid affection, and thereby deprive the latter of all influence upon the vital force."¹ And he states, that in order to find among remedial agents one "corresponding by similarity to the disease to be cured, the more striking, singular, uncommon, and peculiar characteristic signs and symptoms of the case of disease (under treatment) are chiefly and almost solely to be kept in view ; for it is more particularly these, that *very similar ones* in the list of symptoms of the medicine sought for must correspond to, in order to constitute that medicine the most suitable for effecting the cure."² For the homœopathic mode of treatment, as he elsewhere declares it, is that "in which there is employed for the totality of the symptoms of the natural disease, a medicine capable of producing *THE MOST SIMILAR SYMPTOMS POSSIBLE* in the healthy individual."³

Let us examine by the light of Hahnemann's own law, as thus declared in his own language, whether the instances which he himself adduces in favour of this law in the *Organon*, are truly in any degree in favour of the doctrine, *similia similibus curantur* ; or whether they are not, on the contrary, altogether subversive of it. And in doing this, let us take again, as in the last chapter, the very instances which he himself selects and adduces in the course of his *Organon*, as showing and proving, in the operations of Nature, the law of *similia similibus curantur* ; instances, namely, of Nature curing a pre-existing disease by the curative substitution or super-vention of another similar disease. For, to use his own words, "All the rapid and perfect cures which Nature ever performed, were *always* effected by the supervention upon the old disease of one of a similar character."⁴

¹ See *Organon*, p. 133.

² *Ib.* p. 234.

³ *Ib.* 175.

⁴ *Organon*, p. 165. Some of the similarities upon which he explains cures homœopathically, by the action of medicines, are perhaps still stranger and wilder than those noticed in the text as cures homœopathically by the action of diseases upon each other. In some of Hahnemann's own examples, the supposed "similarity (says Dr Bushnan) is taken to exist between the *NATURE* of the substance employed and some product of the disease treated ; as when we are told how 'a fatty discharge from the intestine was cured by olive oil ;' or between the *NAME* of the agent and the complaint, as in cases where 'the application of cold water to the body has cured cholera, because

When discussing the curative effects of Measles in removing pre-existing diseases by its alleged similarity of symptoms to these pre-existing diseases, Hahnemann (besides adducing the erroneous instance which we have examined in the last chapter, of measles curing or preventing whooping-cough), brings forward, in addition, as an illustration of the same homœopathic action in the same disease, the following examples:—

“If,” says he, “the Measles come in contact with a disease resembling it in its chief symptom, the eruption, it can indisputably remove and effect a homœopathic cure of the latter. Thus, a chronic *herpetic* eruption was entirely and permanently (homœopathically) cured by the breaking out of the measles, as Kortum observed. An excessively burning *miliary* rash on the face, neck, and arms, that had lasted six years, and was aggravated by every change of weather, under the influence of measles, assumed the form of a swelling of the surface of the skin; after the measles had run its course, the rash was cured and returned no more.”¹

Now, perhaps it is impossible to find any two diseases more dissimilar from measles, than chronic herpes and miliaria. There are many species of disease marked by eruptions on the skin, more or less distinct and different from each other.² But perhaps no one disease, presenting a cutaneous eruption, is more different and distinct from all other cutaneous diseases than measles is from herpes and miliaria. Any similarity existing between them, consists merely in these three several affections being marked by an eruption on the same structure—the skin; but each of these eruptions differs most distinctly and specifically from the others. It would, in fact, be as legitimate and philosophical to aver that a salmon or a

the surface of the body in that disease is cold?” Yet even Hahnemann himself would confess, that the object of thus momentarily applying cold is to produce reaction, accompanied by heat and not cold. The ‘medicinal disease,’ then, or in vulgar parlance, the effect sought to be attained, is heat, not cold,—a curious illustration of similarity.”—*Homœopathy and the Homœopaths*, p. 105.

¹ Organon, p. 150.

² In propounding his averments regarding similitudes in this and other instances, as that measles is “like” to chronic herpes and miliaria, etc., etc., Hahnemann evidently counts on an amount of faith and flexibility on the part of his subservient disciples quite equal, at least, to that of Polonius:—“Do you see yonder elond that’s almost in shape of a camel?” “By the mass, and it is *like* a camel, indeed!” “Methinks, it is *like* a weasel.” “It is backed *like* a weasel.” “Or *like* a whale?” “VERY LIKE a whale.”—*Hamlet*, Act III.

partridge had a "similarity" to the leopard, because, like the leopard, it was marked also by spots upon its surface, as it is to aver that chronic herpes and miliaria have a similarity to measles, because they have each of them a cutaneous eruption as a symptom. "A single one of the symptoms present is no more the disease than a single foot (or finger) is the man himself" (p. 114.) And measles is truly in every respect a disease as "*dissimilar as possible*" to the instances of herpes and miliaria, which Hahnemann averred the measles cured in consequence of the similarity of the measles to them. The two cases of herpes and miliaria adduced by Hahnemann were chronic affections, produced (according at least to his own doctrine) by suppressed or lurking itch; and they were running an undefined course, having already existed for years. On the other hand, measles is an acute disease, always running a defined course, and coming to a fixed and certain termination. Measles is a specific form of fever and a contagious affection. In both of these respects it differs entirely from herpes and miliaria. And indeed, it does differ from them in every other respect also, except in the single and simple one already alluded to, of all the three affections being accompanied with an eruption on the skin; but even the cutaneous eruption in measles is totally dissimilar and different in form and character from the eruption in herpes and miliaria.

In another paragraph, Hahnemann, after telling us that his object is to speak about "*something determinate and indubitable*," goes on to state that small-pox, upon the principle *similia similibus curantur*, has, as a curative agent, "removed and cured a number of affections with similar symptoms." As instances of the curative removal in this way of affections by small-pox, on the principle of cure by similars, he adduces in this same paragraph (§ xlv.) examples of the disappearance, after small-pox, of chronic ophthalmia, chronic amaurosis, deafness, dyspnoea, testicular swelling, and a dysenteric state of the bowels.¹

It is unnecessary to dwell on the fact of the very striking absence of "*similarity*" between these several diseased states and small-pox. And it is further, I would remark, the strongest proof of the impossibility which Hahnemann felt, to adduce from Nature any such true and real instances of his "unerring and infallible" law, that

¹ Organon, p. 147.

similar diseases cure similar affections, when he brought forward, as examples of the operation of this law of similarity, the disappearance of such dissimilar diseases under or after attacks of a disease (small-pox), with which they have no analogy.

Eruptive fevers not unfrequently leave the affected individual with impaired health and various *sequelæ*. But this is not always the result. For measles, small-pox, and other fevers, particularly when of a mild form, have long been recognised as occasionally acting as powerful curative *alteratives* upon the human constitution. The older physicians averred that attacks of them sometimes “discharged old peccant humours and depurated the blood.” And though pathology and pathological chemistry cannot yet tell us, and perhaps never will tell us, in what particular mode or modes they effect these salutary changes, yet every physician is acquainted with the occasional occurrence of such results. That such results, however, in whatever way they do happen, are not accomplished in accordance with the homœopathic law *similia similibus curantur*, is evident from the circumstance already referred to, that the small-pox is an affection as “dissimilar as possible” from, instead of being “as similar as possible” to, those affections which it occasionally removes,—as seen in the very examples brought forward by Hahnemann.

Small-pox, when throwing out, as it sometimes does, pustules, or producing inflammation upon different portions of the mucous membrane of the body, as the conjunctiva, intestinal canal, etc., may, in consequence, give rise to a form of ophthalmia or dysentery. And it is on this ground that Hahnemann argues that the removal of the pre-existing chronic ophthalmia or dysenteric affection is an effect of the similarity between the small-pox and them. He regards small-pox as similar to ophthalmia and dysentery, because the latter affections sometimes form *single* symptoms in the former disease.

But, again, his own instances prove that his explanation is not the true explanation of the result he alludes to. For small-pox never, I believe, *caused* functional amaurosis or palsy of the optic nervous apparatus,—one of the instances which he adduces, as a disease which has been *cured* by small-pox. The cure of the amaurosis, which he cites as following an attack of small-pox, is thus not explicable on any principle or hypothesis of *similarity* of symptoms. And though, in order to account, upon this principle of *similia similibus curantur*, for the removal, in two instances which he quotes, of testicular hardness and swelling, he unhesitatingly avers that

“swelling of the testicle, even of a very severe character, is a frequent symptom of small-pox,” I believe we are quite justified in doubting either that such a symptom is a *frequent* symptom of small-pox (as Hahnemann declares it), or even that it ever occurs at all as a symptom attending upon and *caused* by small-pox. It, with other affections, may possibly, on the generally acknowledged principle which I have already alluded to, of the occasional “*alterative*” effects of eruptive fevers, disappear after an attack of small-pox, or other acute eruptive maladies, but assuredly not BECAUSE it was a disease to which small-pox presented a similarity. But even let us concede for a moment, for argument’s sake, that there is a “similarity” such as he wishes to be granted him in the above instances, of measles with herpes and miliaria, or of small-pox with ophthalmia, amanosis, etc., and that this degree of similarity is all that is requisite for the working and success of the law *similia similibus curantur*, it necessarily follows that a *very small* degree of similarity indeed is all that is demanded for the successful operation of the law. It also necessarily follows (as is acknowledged in the quotations which we have given above from the *Organon*), that if the similarity between the new curative disease and the pre-existing affection is *greater*, or, to use his own words, when they are “*as similes as possible*,” the perfect cure, removal, or “annihilation” of the old disease, by the new similar disease, becomes only the MORE sure and certain. But is such the fact? Does it hold good, as a law in nature, that diseases infinitely more “similar” in their nature and symptoms than the above examples, at once and permanently cure and remove each other? In order to obtain an answer, let us interrogate nature further; and that still in relation to the very instances which Hahnemann adduces in his *Organon*.

Small-pox and measles are two diseases which are “similar” to each other in various most important respects. They are, both of them, forms of fever of specific origin; both spread by contagion; both run definite courses of rise, acme, and decline; both, as a general rule, attack an individual but once during life; both are attended with eruptions scattered over the surface of the body; in both, these eruptions come to a certain termination, after a limited and fixed period of duration; and in both diseases the appearance of the eruption is preceded, for some days, by peculiar febrile symptoms. Indeed, the similarity between small-pox and measles is *so great*, that the two

diseases were long looked upon and described by physicians as varieties of one and the same affection, and not as two separate and distinct species of diseases. "This error," says Dr Willan, "was transmitted by medical authors through more than eight centuries."¹ "It might," observes Dr Bateman, "be supposed that, after the existence of these eruptive fevers had been so clearly pointed out by the Arabians, their distinctive characters would have been speedily ascertained, even by ordinary observers. But the fact was directly the reverse. Almost a thousand years elapsed, during which the small-pox, measles, and scarlet fever continued to commit their ravages, and physicians continued to record them; while the individuals who were spared by one of these maladies were seen to suffer successively from attacks of the others. Nevertheless, they were still viewed through the eyes of the Arabians, and were universally deemed varieties of one and the same disease, until near the beginning of the eighteenth century. And it was not till towards the close of that age of enlightened observation, that the distinct character and independent origin of these three contagious disorders were universally perceived and acknowledged. We not only find (he continues) the able and learned Sennertus, in the middle of the seventeenth century, discussing the question, 'Why the disease, in some constitutions, assumes the form of small-pox, and in others that of measles?'—(*Medicin. Pract.*, lib. iv. cap. 12.)—but, in the posthumous work of Dicmerbroeck, an intelligent Dutch professor, published in 1687, it is affirmed that small-pox and measles differ only in degree: 'Differunt (scil. morbilli) a variolis accidentaliter, vel quoad magis et minus.'—(*Tractat. de Variolis et Morbillis*, cap. 14.) And, still later, the same assertion was made by J. Christ. Lange, a learned professor at Leipsic: 'Præterea tam morbilli quam variolæ sunt eruptiones in eo duntaxat discrepantes, quod vel minus vel magis appareant,' etc.—(*Miscell. Med. Curios.*, § xxxiv.)"²

All physicians now acknowledge that small-pox and measles are not the same disease, nor varieties even of the same species of disease, but are two different and distinct affections. They are not identical in their course and symptoms; but they are, as we have already stated and shown, *similar*, "*very similar*," in many respects;

¹ Dr Willan on Cutaneous Diseases, p. 258.

² Bateman's Cutaneous Diseases (1829) p. 105. See also, on the same subject, Dr Montgomery in the "Cyclopædia of Medicine," vol. iii. p. 625; Dr Gregory's "Lectures on Fevers," p. 12, etc., etc.

and certainly infinitely MORE SIMILAR to each other than measles is to herpes or miliaria, or than small-pox is to ophthalmia, amaurosis, etc. If the homœopathic law, therefore, were true, and if two affections, with symptoms "similar," or as "similar as possible," to each other, "*invariably*, and in every case, annihilate one another, whenever they meet together in the organism,"¹ then assuredly these two diseases, measles and small-pox, when they meet together in the organism, ought to have this homœopathic effect upon each other. But that they have no such homœopathic effect upon each other, is, on the contrary, most assuredly the fact. For sometimes, when the contagion of the two diseases has attacked the same individual at or near the same time, the measles, after they have broken out, have been occasionally checked for a time (but only checked, NOT cured or removed) by the small-pox, which came somewhat later,—the measles again resuming their course on the body of the affected person after the disappearance of the small-pox; and sometimes, particularly in instances of inoculated variola, small-pox, in the same way, has become suspended in its course, till the measles have run through their progress, and then the small-pox has completed its course subsequently to the disappearance of the measles. Again, however, in other instances, another series of phenomena have been seen when the two diseases have simultaneously attacked the same person; for Russell, Rainey, and many others,² have occasionally witnessed both small-pox and measles present, and progressing, each in its own course, on the body of the same person at the same time. "Mighty nature herself," says Hahnemann, "has at her command, as instruments for effecting homœopathic cures, little more than the fixed miasmatic diseases, measles and small-pox." "And yet (he adds) with them we can point to some beautiful homœopathic cures, all so many incontrovertible proofs of the great, the sole, therapeutic law of nature that obtains in them, *cure by similarity of symptoms*."³

Thus, doubtlessly, the very diseases to which Hahnemann appeals in evidence of the "eternal law" of homœopathic cure, are in-

¹ Organon, p. 145.

² I cite the evidence of Russell and Rainey from Hahnemann's own "Organon," p. 142, where he adduces the testimony of Maurice and Ettmüller to the same fact of the occasional co-existence of measles and small-pox. Diemerbroeck, Sidobre, Bergius, Jones, Manget, Ling, Tracey, De La Garde, Rilliet and Barthez, etc., have published cases of the complication and co-existence of small-pox with measles.

³ Organon, p. 152.

stances, which I believe every unprejudiced mind must allow to be most utterly subversive of the idea and truth of that law. The preceding instance, for example, of small-pox and measles, affords evidence of an incontrovertible kind, that diseases with a certain concurrence and succession of distinctive symptoms do NOT "remove and cure" other diseases having as nearly as possible exactly the same concurrence and succession of symptoms. "*Invariably*, and in every case (avers Hahnemann, p. 145), do two diseases, differing certainly in kind, but very similar in their phenomena and effects, and in the sufferings and symptoms they severally produce, ANNIHILATE one another whenever they meet together in the organism." Such is not the fact with regard to small-pox and measles, two diseases "differing certainly in kind, but very similar in their phenomena and effects." Hahnemann boldly affects to get over the insurmountable difficulties connected with such natural contradictions of his "eternal" and "infallible" law, by coolly and characteristically averring that small-pox and measles are diseases which are (to use his own word) "*dissimilar*,"¹ and are not "*similar*," to each other,—an allegation and averment which the whole past history of these diseases (as cited from Willan and Bateman, etc., in a preceding page), and which their whole symptoms, courses, causes, and characters most flatly contravene and disprove; whilst we have seen he maintains, on the contrary, that measles removes and cures chronic herpes and miliaria, because it has a similarity to these two; and that small-pox, as a disease, removes and cures chronic ophthalmia, amaurosis, etc., because, forsooth, it also has a similarity to these diseases. The new or curative disease should be, to use his own words, "*as similar as possible* to the disease to be cured." And doubtlessly the cases which I have adduced above from the "*Organon*," of measles curing herpes and miliaria, and of small-pox curing ophthalmia, amaurosis, etc., afford no evidence of the truth of this law; for certainly, in these instances the curing and cured diseases were not "*as similar as possible* to each other;" whilst, on the contrary, the history of measles and small-pox affords the most direct, distinct, and deliberate contradiction to this alleged "*infallible law*;" for here, though the two affections are in many respects "*as similar as possible* to each other," they do not possess the power which they

¹ See his "*Organon*," p. 136, 142, etc.; and his "*Lesser Writings*," p. 511. He offers no reason whatever for considering them "*dissimilar*;" perhaps because he felt it altogether impossible to adduce any.

ought to possess, if homœopathy were true, of one immediately and permanently “curing” and “annihilating” the other.

In studying the instances which Hahnemann himself gives from diseases, in evidence of the infallibility of his law, *similia similibus curantur*, we find, in short, no such relation of constant sequence between the alleged cause and alleged effect, as the certainty of any principle or law of even a low degree of generality peremptorily demands. But a high general or universal “infallible law,” such as the *similia similibus curantur* is avowed to be, ought, as all logic teaches us, to be a fact which holds invariably true in reference to *all* the cases coming within its scope and range, and which should and can present no exceptions in the cases or instances pertaining to it. The alleged law of *similia similibus* breaks down, however, entirely and utterly under any such testing of its truth. In fact, this alleged universal law of cure by similarity, when tried, as in the present chapter, by Hahnemann’s own selected instances, eminently succeeds (as in measles removing miliaria and herpes) where it ought to fail; and, on the contrary, it as eminently fails (as in measles not removing small-pox) where, if true, it ought undoubtedly to succeed.¹ Nor is it possible to explain away these and other innumerable failures as exceptions. An unerring unchangeable law (such as the *similia similibus curantur* is upheld to be by Hahnemann and his followers) cannot admit of any exceptions whatever; for to allow of exceptions, is to allow, in other words, that the law is *not* an infallible general law, and must be rejected and abandoned as such. Subsequently we shall see strong reasons, in addition to the above, for doubting whether the alleged law possesses the attributes of a law, even of the very lowest degree or type of generality; or whether, in short, it has any of the characters of a law at all.

¹ “An enthusiastic philosopher once constructed a very satisfactory theory on some subject or other, and was not a little proud of it. ‘But the facts, my dear fellow,’ said his friend, ‘the facts do not agree with your theory?’ ‘Don’t they,’ replied the philosopher shrugging his shoulders, ‘then so much the worse for the facts!’”—Mr Brodribb’s *Pamphlet*, p. 23.

CHAPTER XVII.

DIFFERENT VIEWS OF THE OBJECTS OF TREATMENT IN DISEASES TAKEN BY THE LEGITIMATE PHYSICIAN AND THE HOMŒOPATHIST: INSTANCES OF RELATIVE TREATMENT BY THEM OF PLEURISY, TAPEWORM, POLYPUS, ITCH.

THE homœopathic law *similia similibus curantur* forms, says Hahnemann, "a mode of cure founded on an eternal and infallible law of nature;"¹ and "is the only therapeutic law conformable to nature."² From a pamphlet entitled "A Defence of Hahnemann and his Doctrines," published eight or nine years ago in Edinburgh, the aim of Homœopathy in regard to the field of the actual practice of physic, is as we have already seen:³—"Homœopathy does not aim at the introduction of a new practice into a solitary branch of the medical art, but demands for the field of its sweeping reformation the whole territory of practical medicine, joins issue with the old system on every inch of its possessions, and has to beat it from its fastnesses among the morasses of false experience, of vain hypothesis and theory" (p. 30.) Let us try then to see, in the present chapter, how the application of this homœopathic "sweeping reformation" actually works in medical practice; or rather, let us try to ascertain in what respects legitimate physicians and the practitioners of homœopathy, respectively, view and treat the cases of disease submitted to them. But to make this intelligible, a few prefatory remarks on the composition of diseases seems necessary, in order to enable us to understand the distinction between the treatment of the legitimate physician, and the treatment of the homœopathist.

¹ Organon, p. 156.

² Ibid. p. 55.

³ See antecedently page 3, foot note 2.

Every disease, or case of disease, consists of two parts or elements—viz.,

I. Of some internal pathological change or changes of action or condition in the part or parts which are the seat of the malady; and,

II. Of more or fewer “outwardly cognizable symptoms,” or changes of state or function, to which the inward diseased actions or conditions give rise.

In a preceding page,¹ I have already shown, by various quotations from his “*Organon*,” that Hahnemann maintains, that the second of these parts or elements, viz., the “SYMPTOMS ALONE” form the principal, the “SOLE” matter which the physician “has to *take note* of in every case of disease, and to *remove* by means of his art.” And he maintains that the physician may entirely neglect the internal condition or pathological state producing the symptoms as both a useless and imaginary study. We have seen him, in a previous page (*foot-note*, p. 9), denouncing the utility of one of the branches connected with such a study, viz., pathological anatomy. “Everything,” he observes, “of a really morbid character, and which ought to be cured, consists SOLELY IN THE SUM TOTAL OF THE SYMPTOMS, by means of which the disease demands the medicine requisite for its relief; whilst, on the other hand (adds Hahnemann), every internal cause, every occult quality, or imaginary material morbid principle, is nothing but an empty dream.”—*Organon*, p. 174. And in defence of this opinion, Hahnemann cites the following opinion of Rau:—“The physician whose researches are directed towards the hidden relations in the interior of the organism, may daily err; but the homœopathist who grasps with requisite carefulness the whole group of *symptoms*, possesses a sure guide; and if he succeed in removing the whole group of symptoms, he has likewise most assuredly destroyed the internal hidden cause of the disease.” (*Organon*, p. 112.) “From this indubitable truth,” Hahnemann elsewhere observes, “that besides the collective symptoms, nothing can be discovered in any way, in diseases, where-with they could express their need of aid, it undeniably follows, that the sum of all the symptoms in each individual case of disease, must be the *sole indication—the sole guide*—to direct us in the choice of a curative remedy.”—(*Organon*, p. 120.)

In nothing are the professed objects of legitimate physic, and of

¹ See quotations at pp. 66 and 67.

homœopathy as propounded and practised by Hahnemann himself, more different from each other than in the views which the two systems respectively take of the actual objects of medical treatment, and the means by which they are to relieve the sick. For while the homœopathist fully expects to cure his patients by studying and removing the *external symptoms* of the disease under which they may be suffering, the legitimate practitioner attempts to gain the same end by removing, when possible, the *internal cause, or series of causes*, which are the origin of these symptoms. The homœopathist hopes to cure his patient by “overpowering,” “annihilating,” or “removing,” the external symptoms of the disease. The rational practitioner endeavours to cure his patient by removing, when ascertained, the internal or pathological state, or states, which produce these symptoms.

When the machinery of a watch becomes deranged or diseased, the watch shows some “outwardly existing symptoms” of disturbance in its function of telling correct time. The watchmaker intuitively traces the cause of the disorder to some disturbance or deficiency in the interior organisation of the machine, and cures the watch by correcting and re-adjusting this deranged internal mechanism. If, on the contrary, the watchmaker tried *homœopathically* to correct the disease or derangement in the watch, by acting merely on the “external symptoms,” as shown in the deviation of the handles of it,—as by making these hands go, by a touch of his finger or key, a little faster if they already went too fast, or a little slower if they already went too slow,—would his act be accounted a rational and sane act? A watchmaker might surely, however, as logically propose to correct and amend the working of a diseased watch, by this simple *similia similibus* principle, as a physician could attempt to correct and amend the functions of the diseased body by acting upon the same principle. Would there, at least, not be as much true philosophy in the one attempt as in the other,—in such new watch therapeutics as in the new medical therapeutics?

But to display the important difference between the views and objects of the treatment of disease taken by the legitimate physician and by the homœopathist, perhaps an illustration or two will answer better than any mere didactic discussion. For this purpose let us take the examples of two or three diseases, in order to show the different principles upon which their treatment is respectively conducted by the rational practitioner and by the homœopathist. And in order that these examples may be free from any bias, I shall select

them from the affections of which Hahnemann chances himself to speak in the course of his "Organon,"—taking pleurisy as an example of acute disease; tapeworm and polypus as examples of chronic disease; and itch as an illustration of a malady that in different individuals appears either under the one character or the other.

Relative Treatment of Pleurisy by the Legitimate Physician and by the Homœopathist.

Acute pleurisy has been lately defined in the two following modes:—I. The Nosological or Symptomological,—and II. The Pathological, by Dr Copland, according (1.) as we look upon the disease (as the homœopaths do) as indicated by so many natural-history marks, subjective, or, as Hahnemann terms them, "*outwardly existing, Symptoms*;" and (2.) according as we consider the morbid "*internal Cause or Causes*" of the affection, or its pathological nature. Thus:—

NOSOLOGICAL DEFINITION OF PLEURISY.—"Acute pain in the chest, aggravated by inspiration, commencing with chills or rigors, followed by increased heat, a hard and accelerated pulse; short, dry cough; and by difficult, short, or disordered respiration."

PATHOLOGICAL DEFINITION OF PLEURISY—"Inflammation commencing in, or implicating one or more parts of the pleural expansions, attended either by more or less of a consistent albuminous exudation, false membrane, or adhesion, and by a fluid effusion, varying in their characters with the varying states of different cases; causing pain, symptomatic fever, disordered respiration, dulness on percussion, and alteration of the respiratory sounds."¹

In the practice of legitimate medicine, the two great objects which the physician aims at in the treatment of this malady are,—1, To reduce the inflammatory action in the pleura, the internal or pathological state, which really and essentially constitutes the disease; and 2, To promote the absorption of the inflammatory secretions effused into the sac of the pleura, provided effusion has already occurred. He knows that the accompanying symptoms will vanish when he has subdued and annihilated the morbid action and state of the pleura, on which these symptoms depend; that the effects or symptoms will disappear when the internal cause or internal disease producing them is removed; and for fulfilling this last object the physician has therapeutic means at his command, which very rarely

¹ Dictionary of Practical Medicine, vol. iii. Article, Pleurisy, p. 263.

indeed fail when early and properly employed. "Death," observes Dr Walshe, "is so rare a result of the disease, that I have neither myself (and I have carefully attended to the point since my attention was first drawn to it, years ago, by M. Louis) lost a patient from pure primary idiopathic pleurisy, with or without effusion, nor know of an occurrence of the kind in the practice of others."¹

On the other hand, in the treatment of acute pleurisy, the object of the homœopathist is to give the patient some one remedy which he considers capable of *simulating* the symptoms of the disease (Pleurisy); believing that if he can thus artificially simulate the symptoms of the affection—viz., the accompanying fever, the pain in the side, the dyspnœa, and the cough—the disease itself, that is, the inflammation of the pleura, or the effusions to which that inflammation has given rise, will in consequence be removed and annihilated. He has, he avers, remedies which are capable in this way of removing the symptoms of pleurisy; because he supposes that, when proved upon the healthy constitution, the remedies in question have artificially produced these same symptoms. In the last edition of the "Organon" (p. 12), Hahnemann, for instance, deliberately states, that "by a small globule of the decillionth dilution of aconite juice, with abstinence from vegetable acids, the most violent pleuritic fever, with all its alarming concomitants, is changed into health, and cured in a few, at the most in twenty-four, hours."

We will not stop to expose the characteristic arrogance and truthlessness of the assertion made by Hahnemann in the preceding quotation; his own followers being incapable of producing this result, or any results the least like it, with the same medicine in the same disease (pleurisy).² In a previous

¹ Walshe on "Diseases of the Lungs," 1851, p. 291.

² In the now extinct Homœopathic Hospital at Leipsic, 7 patients were confessed to have died out of 65 admitted with pleurisy. "I hesitate," says Dr Henderson of Edinburgh, "to believe that these accounts are free from mistake, which summarily tell of acute pleurisy, pneumonia, or peritonitis, having yielded, in a few hours or in a day, to one or two doses of aconite or bryonia, of the 30th potency."—*Homœopathic Journal* for 1850, p. 348. "We have searched," says Dr Bushman, "the records of homœopathic cases in vain for one solitary instance of a single disease worthy of the name, being cured, even on homœopathic showing, by one single infinitesimal dose."—*Homœopathy and the Homœopaths*, p. 46. In a previous page (p. 65), we have found Hahnemann declaring, that if a single grain of gold be duly commixed through a mass of sugar, fifty times the size of the whole earth, a single globule taken out of this enormous mass, will, if merely smelt, restore within an hour a desponding and suicidal patient to peace of mind and love of life. In the

by the exhibition of any known medicine, homœopathic or allopathic ; and attempting to remove the disease by removing homœopathically, with aconite, the accompanying fever and other subjective symptoms, would be like the old exorcists trying to destroy an individual by attacking or by covering over his shadow.

Hahnemann says, the practitioner only needs to remove the totality of the symptoms of a disease, and he has removed the entire disease.¹ On the contrary, in pleurisy, the totality of the external symptoms may be absent, and yet the disease be proceeding in its usual course; or these symptoms may be removed, and the disease remain untouched; while the removal of the real disease itself,—that is, of the pleuritic inflammation and effusions,—is the only sure method of taking away the totality of the symptoms,—the symptomatic effects disappearing when the pathological cause producing them is withdrawn. *Causâ ablatâ tollitur effectus.*

*Relative Treatment of Tapeworm by Legitimate Physicians
and Homœopaths.*

Let us adduce an instance of chronic disease, in order to illustrate the difference of principles between homœopathic treatment and the treatment pursued by legitimate physicians ; and for this purpose let us take the treatment of tapeworm. The presence of a tapeworm or tapeworms in the intestinal canal is generally accompanied (according to a summary given by the best and latest American author on the practice of medicine), by one or more of the following symptoms :—

“Dull pain in the forehead ; giddiness ; buzzing in the ears ; dulness of the eyes,

of this plant *alone* PRODUCE pleurisy and inflammation of the lungs ;” and arguing from this alleged case of Wagner, Hahnemann maintains that the production of pleurisy by squills in this instance is the reason why, on the principle of *similia similibus curantur*, De Haen, Sarcone, and Pringle found squills efficacious in their practices in the treatment of pleurisy.—(*Organon*, p. 66). But it is a most unfortunate example to adduce. For Wagner’s case (upon which this strange homœopathic induction is built) was a complicated case of rheumatism, heart disease, dyspnœa, and dropsy (probably an instance of albuminuria), in a person of fifty years of age, upon which intercurrent attacks of fever, followed by hepatitis and pleurisy, supervened. In the treatment, squills, in combination with other remedies—but not *alone* (as Hahnemann’s words infer)—were used ; but there is not the slightest shadow of evidence to suggest or show that the use of the *squills* was in any way whatever the CAUSE of the pleuritic attack.—(See Wagner’s *Observationes Clinicæ*, p. 17).

¹ See antecedently, p. 66.

which are rounded by a dark circle ; œdematous eyelids ; dilated pupils ; frequent and spasmodic movements of the eyes ; alternate paleness and flushing of the face ; paleness of the lips ; peculiar movements of the nose and mouth ; emaciation ; alternate loss and excess of appetite ; cravings for particular articles of food ; offensive breath ; furred tongue ; spitting and vomiting of thin mucous in the mornings ; itching at the nose, anus, and vulva ; grinding of the teeth, especially during sleep ; constriction of the throat ; swelling of the belly ; gurgling, shooting pains, and a sense of pinching about the umbilicus ; a feeling in the morning as of a foreign body moving in the bowels ; amelioration of all the symptoms under the use of farinaceous food, hot bread, and coffee ; finally, depression of spirits, and a train of nervous derangements in protracted cases.”¹

The homœopathic principle is, that the removal of the totality of the symptoms of disease by the exhibition of a drug or drugs capable of simulating these symptoms, constitutes the sole, unerring, eternal law of cure. And if the disease depends, as “seven-eighths” of all chronic diseases like this do, upon itch-miasm, the medicine must further not only be capable of simulating the disease, but also be reputed antipsoric in its character. Supposing, however, that the homœopaths did actually possess one or two remedies which were considered capable of causing, and hence of curing, more or fewer of these symptoms produced by the presence of tapeworms, Would the removal of these symptoms remove the disease itself,—that is, the tapeworm ? Assuredly not. On the contrary, the object which the legitimate physician has in view in the treatment of this and of other diseases, is not to “extinguish” merely the external effects or symptoms of the disease itself, but to remove the internal or pathological state, which is the cause of these effects or symptoms. In the malady in question, for instance, he gives some vermicide remedy which is capable of poisoning and killing the worm, and which yet does not injuriously affect the patient—as male-shield-fern, kosso, pomegranate, or the like, feeling assured that the removal of the symptoms will certainly not remove the worm ; but that the removal of the worm will certainly remove the symptoms.

Before leaving this topic of the treatment of Tapeworm, let me offer two remarks. *First*, In a note on this subject in the *Organon* (p. 22), after trying to show that the various species of tapeworm are only found along with the taint of itch, and averring (but, as usual, without any proof), that they should disappear when that taint is cured, Hahnemann quietly adds, “ It is worthy of remark, that the morbid symptoms of patients suffering from tapeworm are generally

¹ Professor Wood's Practice of Medicine, vol. i., p. 629.

of such a kind, that they are rapidly relieved *homœopathically*, by the smallest dose of tincture of male-fern root." (P. 23.) Dr Laurie, in his "Homœopathic Medicine" (p. 267), tells us, under the head of the treatment of Tapeworm, that male-fern, when given, should be exhibited in the dose of "one drop of the concentrated tincture in a teaspoonful of water, night and morning, for four days,"—most certainly *not* an infinitesimal dose. For the concentrated ethereal tincture of this drug may be made so strong as to be sometimes poisonous to the worm in a very small quantity. But what we wish to observe is this, that the remedy in question is not, as Hahnemann coolly declares it to be, a strictly homœopathic remedy. The last edition of the *Organon*, containing this statement, was published in 1833. In the second edition, however, of Jahr's "Manual of Homœopathic Medicine,"¹ (1847), no symptoms are mentioned under the article "Male-Fern," because the male-fern had not, even then (1847), been yet proved upon the healthy person; "It is a medicine (says Jahr, p. 245) as yet entirely unknown;" and, consequently, Hahnemann's assertion (in 1833), that it was *homœopathic* in its action, was a mere gratuitous averment. But,

Secondly, Hahnemann avers that there is no other way in which the curative effects of medicine can be successfully ascertained except by experimenting with them in healthy persons.² In reference to this statement, look at the character of the remedies for tapeworm: The vermicide longest known is the male-shield-fern. Dioscorides, Theophrastus, Galen, and others of the old physicians, were acquainted with it and its powers. The one last brought into notice, is the Abyssinian Kosso. Both of these remedies are pretty sure and efficacious poisons for the tapeworm. And no doubt their anthelmintic quality was first discovered by their use, not upon healthy persons (as the homœopathists propose), but upon persons diseased and affected with tapeworm. In experimenting with these drugs upon the *healthy* man, as is supposed to be the proper method of finding out remedies in homœopathy, who, in fact, could ever have discovered that the two medicines in question had a strong vermicide property belonging to them? No amount of dose of them would ever, in a healthy man, produce anything *similar* to a

¹ Edition of 1847, vol. i. p. 245.

² "The method *ab usu in morbis* can never be of the slightest use to the practitioner, and can never reveal anything true and useful as to the curative powers of each medicinal substance."—*Hahnemann's Mat. Medica Pura*, p. 33.

tapeworm. Nor could we judge *a priori* from any of their properties that they would have the vermicide effect which they possess. "Neither (observes Dr Pereira) botanical characters, sensible qualities, nor chemical composition, would have induced us to suspect that *Kosso* possesses the valuable anthelmintic properties which experience has shown that it does. Our confidence in the anthelmintic properties of *Kosso* rests on experience only; and the evidence on this point is very strong. All modern travellers in Abyssinia are agreed on the great success of the remedy on the natives of that country; and the experience of physicians in France, England, Germany, and Switzerland, confirms the favourable reports made by those who have seen the *Kosso* used in its native country."¹

*Relative Treatment of Polypus, by Legitimate Physicians
and Homœopaths.*

To show the distinction between the principles of allopathy and homœopathy, let us further adduce the treatment of a local disease by the two systems.

"The adherents of the old school," says Hahnemann, "believe, that by putting a ligature on polypi, etc.,² . . . they have removed the affection, conquered the disease, and conducted a rational treatment directed towards the cause. But what is the result? The new forms of disease that sooner or later, but inevitably, appear, caused by this mode of treatment (but which they pretend are entirely new diseases), which are always worse than the original affections, sufficiently prove the error of their notions, and might and should open their eyes to the deeper-seated immaterial nature of the disease and its dynamic (spiritual) origin, which can only be removed by dynamic means."—(*Organon*, p. 14.)

Polypus of the uterus (to take it as an example, and it is perhaps the most common form of polypus seen in practice) is usually accompanied by the following as its most marked symptoms, viz.:—1. Hemorrhage and the effects of hemorrhage, as palpitation, bloodlessness, œdema, etc.; and, 2. Various mechanical symptoms, as a sensation of weight, and symptoms from mechanical pressure of the polypus tumour upon the neighbouring organs. If the polypus were uninterfered with, and allowed to proceed, so as to produce death,

¹ Pharmaceutical Journal for July 1, 1850, p. 15.

² Hahnemann, in the paragraph cited, enumerates a long list of other diseases (see *Organon*, p. 14), but for brevity's sake I take as illustration the first on his list,—viz., polypus.

the patient at last usually gradually dies from the mere loss of blood. To treat this disease homœopathically, or on the principle *similia similibus curantur*, some antipsoric homœopathic remedy or remedies ought to be swallowed or smelt capable of inducing also symptoms similar to the different symptoms resulting from polypus. Were any such remedy or remedies known, their employment would, however, be of no avail to the patient, if they did not remove the diseased polypus ; which from time to time would continue to produce new attacks of hemorrhage. And in this case how very different indeed is the treatment of the rational practitioner from that of the symptomatic homœopathist. The “old” rational system of medicine teaches us to place a silken ligature round the neck of the polypus ; or to use some other such means for its entire removal. And ample experience shows, that from that moment the hemorrhage generally ceases ; and the patient becomes gradually restored, as if (to use the comparison of Dupuytren) “she had been called back from the grave to renewed life.” But, argues Hahnemann, if you cure the patient in this way, new forms of disease will appear, caused by this allopathic mode of treatment. Most assuredly such an allegation is a mere gratuitous and groundless assumption. In no disease can a cure be more simple, or more sure and more permanent, than in this ; while the mere omission of the proper treatment of the disease is almost certain to be followed by dangerous or fatal consequences. “If a polypus,” as the late Dr Gooch tersely and truly observes, “be detected and removed, the person not only lives, but regains perfect health ; if it be mistaken and neglected, it occasions the death of the patient.”¹

*Relative Treatment of Itch by Legitimate Physicians
and Homœopaths.*

As one more example, in illustration of the difference between the principles of homœopathic and allopathic treatment, we take, as proposed at p. 176, the instance of a disease, which may be either acute or chronic, viz., Itch.

The disease of all others which Hahnemann and his disciples affect to have studied most, and to have been especially successful in curing, is, as we have seen, *scabies* or *itch*, and its effects. We have already had occasion to state, that, as allowed by all modern phy-

¹ See his Essays, p. 242.

sicians, and even by the homœopathists themselves, this disease consists primarily in the presence and irritation of a small insect (the *Acarus Scabiei*) imbedded in the diseased skin, in the vicinity of the eruption. The natural history of this insect has been elaborately studied of late years by several continental physicians ; and the most rapid and certain means of destroying it, have been attempted to be ascertained by careful experiments.

The difference between the treatment of disease by rational medicine, and its treatment by homœopathy, in the case of itch is great. Hahnemann lays down the homœopathic treatment of primary or acute itch in the following terms in his *Organon* :—

“ Even a *primary* itch eruption, of recent origin,” says Hahnemann, “ though it may have spread all over the body, may be perfectly cured, in persons that are not too weakly, by a dose of tincture of sulphur, thirtieth dilution, given every seven days, in the course of from ten to twelve weeks (accordingly with ten or twelve such globules), so that it will seldom be necessary to aid the cure with a few doses of *carbo vegetabilis* (vegetable charcoal) thirtieth dilution, also given at the rate of one dose in the week, without the slightest external treatment, besides frequent changes of linen, and good regimen.”—(*Organon*, p. 292.)

In reference to this homœopathic treatment, we venture to aver, that if the patient will do *nothing* whatever locally to the skin, or in other words, to the structure in which the insect has its habitat, except apply, as recommended by Hahnemann, frequent changes of linen, the itch insect will continue to disport itself upon his cutaneous surface for months and years, instead of weeks ; and that the homœopathic infinitesimal dose recommended by Hahnemann, namely,—1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000th of a grain of sulphur, or of vegetable charcoal, swallowed or smelled by the homœopathic patient, will have no influence whatever in the extermination of the itch insect, or the destruction of its ova.

But, taking Hahnemann's own success in the cure of the disease in his own words, the homœopathic victim of an itch eruption of recent origin does not, he allows, get rid of the filthy affection under which he is suffering, if under homœopathic treatment, till the expiry of some *ten or twelve weeks*. It is an affection, however, which certainly does not thus require months or weeks for its removal. The common local sulphur treatment usually entirely removes it in three or four days. And numerous late experiments in the Parisian hospitals and else-

where have shown that, with some preparations, a treatment of *two or three hours* only, is sufficient to destroy an attack of primary itch ; for the whole treatment consists merely in applying such local poisons to the seat of the eruption as are capable of destroying the insect and its ova. The iodides of sulphur and of potassium, when applied locally to the affected part, kill the insect in a few minutes ; and a solution of alcohol and staphisagra destroys them or their ova in about a quarter of an hour, without acting as an irritant upon the patient's skin.¹

In this way, as stated in the foot-note below, out of 400 patients submitted to a treatment extending only to *two hours*, 396 were at once cured ; 4 only required to return for further advice ; and, of

¹ In confirmation of this remark, let me quote a paragraph or two from the last work in the English language on skin diseases, viz., the excellent practical treatise on this subject, published last year by my friend, Dr Neligan of Dublin :—

“ As sulphur, observes Dr Neligan, never fails to cure the disease, it is the universally admitted remedy for it ; none other, indeed, would require to be alluded to, were it not that the unpleasant odour of sulphur renders its employment in some instances inadmissible. The general method of using this substance for the treatment of scabies is by the local inunction of ointments containing it, either alone or compounded with alkalies ; in the latter form it is generally employed in the present day in France, and found to be most efficacious there when used alone : the combination was first introduced by M. Helmerich, is composed of two parts of sulphur, one of carbonate of potash, and eight of lard. The surface of the entire body, but more particularly of the affected parts, should be first washed well with a strong solution of soft soap, the patient then placed for a quarter of an hour in an alkaline bath, containing a pound of the carbonate of potash to twenty gallons of water, at the temperature of 92°, the skin well dried, and this sulphuro-alkaline ointment afterwards thoroughly rubbed in ; the disease may thus be effectually cured in two or three days, a single friction, preceded by the alkaline and saponaceous bath, being used daily. Out of upwards of 700 persons, treated on a plan nearly similar to this at the Hôpital St Louis in Paris, M. Bazin only met with six unsuccessful cases, all the rest being cured on the third day.* M. Hardi, who succeeded M. Bazin in the charge of the itch wards in this hospital, has introduced a plan of using the sulphuro-alkaline ointment there, by which the period required for a complete cure is reduced to *two hours*. His method is as follows :—‘ On the admission of the patient, the whole surface of the body is rubbed for half an hour with soft soap, *savon noir* ; he is then placed in a bath for an hour, and the body well rubbed while in it, and at the end of that time general frictions made, and continued for half an hour, with Helmerich's ointment. The *acarus*,’ adds M. Hardi, ‘ is thus killed, and the patient consequently cured.’ Of 400 patients thus treated, it is said that four only required to return for further advice, and of these two had recontracted the disease.”—*Treatise on Diseases of the Skin*, p. 138.

* Journal de Médecine et de Chirurgie Pratiques, Dec. 1851, p. 529.

these four, 2 had received a new infection or new attack of the disease. We venture to assert, without any fear of contradiction, that if, on the other hand, in these 400 cases, Hahnemann's plan had been followed, viz., swallowing or smelling a decillionth of a grain of sulphur or charcoal once a week, with changes of linen and good regimen alone, not 4 out of the 400 would be recovered at the end of his own prescribed time, namely, two or three months. Let the homœopathic treatment of primary Itch, as laid down by Hahnemann himself, be honestly tested, in any public hospital, upon any 400 of the most profound believers in homœopathy, and such, we doubt not, will be found to be the result. Nor is the test absolutely severe or cruel in its spirit; seeing that any day after the end of these *two or three months*, or any day during the intervening period, the disease may, if desired, be removed by an "allopathic" treatment of *two hours'* duration.

And yet, according to Hahnemann, the advantage of homœopathy over "allopathy" is this, that "homœopathy is the true and the only way whereby diseases may be most SURELY, RAPIDLY, and PERMANENTLY extinguished by art; for this mode of cure is founded on an eternal infallible law of nature!"¹

But in the diseases we have been commenting upon, legitimate medicine must be infinitely superior to homœopathy, if Hahnemann's own definition of a perfect cure be taken as a true criterion. For, in the very second paragraph of his *Organon*, he lays it down that "The PERFECTION of a cure is rapid, gentle, and permanent restoration of the health, or removal and annihilation of the disease in its whole extent, in the shortest, easiest, and most harmless way, on *easily comprehensible principles*."²

¹ *Organon*, p. 156.

² *Ibid*, p. 109.

CHAPTER XVIII.

GAIN TO PRACTICAL MEDICINE FROM HOMŒOPATHY; USE OF ALLOPATHIC DOSES BY HOMŒOPATHISTS; HAHNEMANN'S DENOUNCEMENT OF SUCH AUXILIARIES; SOME RESULTS OF ADHESION TO INFINITESIMAL DOSES; ALLEGED HARMLESSNESS OF HOMŒOPATHY.

HOMŒOPATHY (*similia similibus curantur*), with its infinitesimal doses, as practised by Hahnemann and his adherents, is essentially a most interesting and important experiment, in so far as it tests upon a large scale the extent to which nature is capable of curing the diseases of the human body, acute and chronic, by her own unaided efforts, by diet and by regimen, and without the intervention of medicine. For the study of the phenomena and course of diseases, under the influence of pure homœopathy, is certainly the study of them under the unassisted influence of nature; as no rational man, who calmly and dispassionately considers the question, can possibly believe that a dose so ineffably small¹ as the decillionth of a grain of any drug (and the decillionth Hahnemann declared, as we have found, to be the best dose for all affections, either acute or chronic) can have any possible efficacy whatever upon the body, either in a state of health or in a state of disease.²

¹ See the calculations regarding it in the Appendix. To dissolve *one grain* to the decillionth, would require millions of millions of seas the size of our whole planetary system.

² In sober truth, the homœopath, thus exhibiting his billionth or decillionth globules, and foolishly imagining that the globules—and not Nature—are effecting the cure in a case of inflammation, or of fever, or of any other disease, is too flagrantly like the German story of the fly enclosed in the luggage van, and proudly supposing that the velocity of the accompanying railway train was owing to the buzzing of its wings, and not to the powers of the attached locomotive engine. And the fly, like the Hahnemannic practitioner, might argue, and with equal logic too, that the

The interesting experiment relative to the actual amount of the curative powers of nature, which is thus being carried on upon a portion of the sick part of our population, under the name of homœopathy, will, I have no doubt, be attended with one beneficial result,—that it will banish to some extent the indefinite polypharmacy and over-drugging which has confessedly too much prevailed in some parts of medical practice. It is further an experiment that would indubitably prove of great importance and utility in the future history of practical medicine, by showing us exactly what nature—assisted by regimen, by diet, and by medical faith alone, and without any drug at all—can effect in the recovery of the economy from different diseases; provided—

(1), That the homœopathists would faithfully give us true statistical accounts of the results of their practice in different diseases; and provided, also—

(2), That in attaining these results they adhered strictly to the inert and infinitesimal doses of Hahnemann.

In relation, however, to the *first* of these conditions, we have seen in Chapter XII. sufficient, and indeed far more than sufficient, evidence to believe, that the statistical accounts which the homœopathists have hitherto published of the results of their so-called practice, are so inaccurate in some respects, and so faithless in others, as to destroy the interest and value which they would otherwise possess as useful and reliable records of the mere natural history of diseases.

In regard also to the *second* condition alluded to as necessary for ascertaining from homœopathy the exact curative effects of nature—namely, that the homœopathic practitioner, in obtaining his results, should use only infinitesimal, and consequently inert, doses of medi-

flight of the locomotive being homœopathic in relation to its own powers of *flight*, the happy arrival of the train at its destination was the result of the exercise of its homœopathic powers of direction and control, and of the working of that “eternal infallible law,” *similia similibus curantur*. At all events, the disciples of Hahnemann rely upon some not less tenable instances of the *similia similibus* in evidence of their favourite doctrine. And let me add, that the disproportion between a decillionth of a grain of a common homœopathic drug, and the ordinary efficient dose of that drug, is infinitely greater than the disproportion of force between the motory muscular powers of a fly, and the motory mechanical powers of a locomotive; a decillionth dose bearing some such relation to an ordinary dose of any drug as the force of a fly would do to the combined force of all the locomotive engines that have ever yet been constructed in the world.

cine, I fear that this is too constantly broken through to allow us to attach that importance to the results which they would otherwise possess in relation to pathology and practice. I have repeatedly heard of persons who had "tried" homœopathy, being amazed at finding undeniable and sometimes very powerful effects from alleged infinitesimal globules or powders, brought to them by their homœopathic physicians, and carried about by them in their own drug-cases, whilst, when these patients themselves used the very *same* medicines, marked with the very same names, out of their own domestic homœopathic boxes, they found no result whatever to follow. The solution of this paradox is only too obvious; affording, as other matters do, evidence of the box of the practitioner being sometimes provided with allopathic medicines in doses sufficiently active. No infinitesimal globule, tincture, or powder, is provided with so much of the appropriate drug as to impart to the dose any appreciable medicinal taste or smell; but tinctures and powders are often enough given by the professed homœopathist sufficiently disagreeable to both the tongue and nose; and the phials containing them are sometimes in such cases not allowed to leave the hands of the physician, but are regularly brought and carried off by him at each visit. Many homœopathic physicians maintain that the amount of infinitesimal dose of a homœopathic medicine which is given—as whether it is a billionth, quintillionth, or decillionth—matters comparatively little, provided only the proper drug be selected.¹ They have *the* proper drug in some infinitesimal dose in most domestic homœopathic drug-boxes; yet often, it appears, they excuse themselves for using them out of such collections; and no doubt for very adequate reasons. I have already alluded (at p. 33) to strong doses of ordinary drugs being occasionally surreptitiously exhibited by homœopathic practitioners to their patients, under the guise of infinitesimal globules and powders. The following details of an instance of this kind, and previously referred to, are given by a very high authority, Dr Alfred Taylor of London, in his late well-known work on Poisons.

"I am not aware (observes Dr Taylor) that the salts of morphia have been criminally used as poisons in this country; but it is necessary to state that they are

¹ See anteedently, p. 58. "The grand point (says Dr Curie) is to make choice of a good remedy, because *it* will effect a cure at *any* degree of dilution."—*Practice of Homœopathy*, p. 71.

sometimes recklessly prescribed in dangerous doses. The following case, referred to me in July 1847, is instructive in more than one point of view :—

“A lady of this metropolis consulted a homœopathic physician, who had acquired *great repute* as an advocate of the system of infinitesimal doses. He prepared and gave to her some small white powders, with explicit instructions in writing as to the mode of taking them, and the nights on which they were to be taken. She took, as I was informed, two; and on each occasion she suffered from great stupor, and all the symptoms of narcotic poisoning, followed by diarrhœa. A suspicion arose that the powders contained some very active ingredient; and three of them were sent to me for analysis. It was first ascertained that, although in appearance, and from the directions, they were intended to pass as equally divided doses of the same medicine, they differed greatly in weight. The first weighed 3·4 grains: it consisted of calomel and morphia, the latter being in the proportion of *one grain*. The second weighed 1·5 grains: it consisted entirely of *sugar of milk* (or some innocent analogous sugar), and contained no morphia, nor any mineral matter. The third weighed 2 grains: it was composed of calomel and morphia, the latter forming about one-fourth the weight, or half a grain. The cause of the alarming symptoms was at once explained. It will be perceived, from the analysis, that the powders differed from each other in weight by more than one-half; and that the first contained *a dose of morphia which might have proved FATAL, had it been taken according to the written order*; while the second was an innocent powder, of which a person might have swallowed an ounce with impunity, and yet it was less than half the weight of the really poisonous powder. The third contained a full dose of morphia. The quantity of morphia which the patient took cannot be conjectured, as the doses of morphia in the remaining powder followed no regular rule; but it appears to have been sufficient to destroy her confidence for ever in infinitesimal doses! This case, while it shows in an unexpected way the gross deception practised on the public, and the risk of life which must be incurred by such a reckless mode of prescribing, affords a hint of some value to the medical jurist. Let us imagine that the patient had taken the powder containing the grain of morphia, and had died from its effects, and that only the second of the powders, with the written directions, had been forwarded to a chemist for analysis: this would have been found to be sugar of milk, a substance which could be productive of no mischief. Had a charge of manslaughter even arisen, there would have been an admirable ground of defence in the allegation, that the unfortunate deceased had died of apoplexy; for it would have been argued, she could have taken nothing but sugar of milk, with perhaps a harmless decillionth dose of some homœopathic medicine! The prescriber, under these circumstances, would probably have been triumphantly acquitted.”¹

In the preceding instance, the dose of morphia thus given secretly by a homœopathic practitioner of “*great repute*,” under the guise of an infinitesimal homœopathic dose, was almost poisonous² in its amount. I am informed by the gentleman³ who gave these powders

¹ Poisons in relation to Medical Jurisprudence and Medicine, p. 617.

² “Dr Paterson has reported the case of a female, aged 19, who was killed by a dose of *one grain* of the muriate of morphia.”—*Medical Gazette*, vol. xl. for 1847, p. 296.

³ Namely, a physician eminently distinguished, as the homœopaths themselves have allowed, by “his love of truth and justice.”

to Dr Taylor, that the homœopathic practitioner in question is Dr ———, one of the oldest and most distinguished among the homœopathic physicians in England, and one of their most voluminous writers on the errors of “allopathy,” and on the “immutable” and “all-important truths” of homœopathy. Among other matters, this same homœopathic physician has more than once, in his published essays, described the infinitesimal doses of homœopathy as possessing in disease powers “far” exceeding those of the doses and means employed by “allopathic practitioners;” and he has also duly and indignantly denounced all compounds, like the ealomel and opium discovered in his own powders. In commenting upon the preceding case, the Editor of the *Medical Gazette* observes:—

“It is no longer difficult, with these facts before us, to explain the contradictory statements which have been made respecting the potency and effects of homœopathic medicines. We consider that one clearly developed case of this kind extinguishes for ever the doctrine of infinitesimal doses: *Falsus in uno—falsus in omnibus*. No man who has once been convicted of a trick of this description can ever again be trusted; and when he stands forth prominently as the advocate of a particular system of treating disease, and professes to base his success upon the exclusive adoption of this system, while it is proved that he is in secret pursuing a totally different course,—it shows that the whole fabric is unsound, and that to the public it is worse than ‘a mockery, a delusion, and a snare.’ A homœopathist may, if he please, prescribe morphia: to this no one can object; but that he should prescribe this powerful alkaloid in doses from which regular practitioners would shrink, as likely to be dangerous, if not fatal, to their patients,—that he should at the same time PRETEND to employ only billionths and trillionths of a grain,—and, the better to keep up the deception, prescribe an inert substance alternately with this active drug,—is a course which must be condemned as *in the highest degree DISHONEST*.”¹

There are many other potent medicines besides those contained in the above example (morphia and ealomel), which can be easily, though “dishonestly,” used under the same professed form of “infinitesimal doses.” A fifth or a tenth of a grain of elaterium—and less even of its active principle, elaterin—will often act violently as a purgative. A drop of the concentrated tincture of aconite sometimes produces strongly the constitutional medicinal effects of the drug; one-fiftieth of a grain of aconitina has nearly proved fatal; one-fortieth of a grain of atropine (belladonna) is a powerful dose; and death has resulted in the human subject from nine-tenths of a grain or minim of pure prussic acid; and from half a grain of the powder of strychnia, the active principle of nux vomica. A late writer on this subject, in the

¹ *Medical Gazette*, 1847, p. 298.

"Pharmaceutical Journal," after somewhat contemptuously suggesting that Hahnemann greatly relied "on the imagination of his dupes, and suited the size of the dose to the amount of *their* understanding," goes on to remark, that one "artifice of the homœopaths relates to the regulation of the diet; and this is ostensibly founded, not on the applicability of the prescribed regimen to the physical state of the patient, but on the alleged *interference* of certain kinds of food *with the action of the medicine*. Thus (he observes) the infinitesimal sugar-plum is the talisman which rivets the imagination and enchains the reason of the patients; it is the charm which reduces them to insane credulity, and consequent implicit obedience."

"But (the same writer continues) when cases arise in which the *vis medicatrix nature* is not adequate to the cure of the disease, a variety of tricks are resorted to for the purpose of obtaining the aid of medicine, without unmasking the sugar-plum imposition. Sometimes strong medicines—morphia, strychnia, etc.—are administered in appreciable doses, the patient not being aware of the fact. Sometimes patients are *permitted* to take purgatives, or other medicines, on their own responsibility,—the quack pretending to protest against the practice, and administering a globule professedly to counteract the prejudicial effect. A paste, consisting chiefly of aloes, has been lately in fashion among the craft. Patients taking cod-liver oil in globules, have, in some instances, been allowed to take the same remedy in ordinary doses; with the assurance, however, that the medicinal effect is attributable to the homœopathic dose,—the other acting merely as an article of diet. These, and other similar subterfuges, may be compared to the evasion of a man who sells a straw and gives away a pamphlet."

Other writers who have personally been called in to cases where such practices were being carried on by homœopathic practitioners, have published remarks of a similar tenor. Thus,

"The worst part of homœopathy (observes Dr Cormack) is, in my opinion, the *dishonesty* of the majority of those who live by it. When patients are once secured, they are, I think, very rarely treated in accordance with the principles of Hahnemann; but are retained by the combination of every current medical novelty which may at the time be most in favour with the monied throng of quack fanciers. I have not been able to hear of any one who honestly relies on homœopathy for the cure of disease; but I can point to many, calling themselves homœopathic practitioners, who attempt to relieve the symptoms of disease by the same means which we would adopt. . . . So ill disguised of late (he farther remarks) has been the want of accordance between their principles and their practice, that homœopathy has become in England nothing more than a conventional appellation for a very clever quack system—one of the many which from time to time arise, and fasten themselves parasitically to the science of medicine, filling the pockets and cankering the integrity of not a few of its nominal cultivators. A good many patients have come to me from homœopathic doctors; and I have thus discovered that even the commonest and the coarsest of the 'ordinary' means of cure are habitually used by them. Castor-oil and aloes are advised in the ordinary purgative doses; camphor

is given in very large doses in the same circumstances in which I would administer it; croton-oil is used as a counter-irritant; cod-liver oil is relied on in some forms of phthisis; and in several cases of disease, I have actually found that, with the globules, hydropathy and mesmerism were had recourse to.¹ There is nothing here stated but what I can prove to be true.”²

To avoid using, in appropriate cases, the ordinary forms of medicinal sudorifics, aperients, emetics, etc., in their ordinary doses, some practitioners of homœopathy have recourse to every kind of possible means, in order to produce these actions and effects by other than medicinal measures;—such as steaming and poulticing their patients in bed, and giving abundance of fluids to produce diaphoresis; throwing large enemata into the bowels; tickling the fauces to induce vomiting, etc. The same class of practitioners, and other homœopathists, occasionally also, and more especially of late years, affect little or no scruple in using, in acute and other dangerous cases, so-called allopathic drugs in their common doses. But then they employ them with a protest, and under the imposing name of “auxiliaries.” In other words, when their patients require no very active treatment, or no treatment at all, the infinitesimal globules are gravely and assiduously employed, with proper regimen and diet; but when a case, or a period in a case, comes to present actual danger, from the evident omission of medicinal treatment, an allopathic purgative or other appropriate allopathic medicine is employed under the term of an “auxiliary.” In all these cases—according, at least, to the creed of such practitioners and their patients—it is the infinitesimal drop or globule that actually *cures* the disease; while the allopathic drug is only (in their language at least), a palliative or an “auxiliary” to the homœopathy. It is an auxiliary, however, in most such cases, exactly in the sense in which it was used by the braggart drum-boy, when he vaunted that *he* himself had defeated the French army at Waterloo,—though he allowed at the same time that for this purpose he had incidentally used the English cannon, cavalry, and troops, as his “auxiliaries” in the work.

In terms, perhaps unnecessarily strong and severe, Mr Brodribb censures and denounces this conjoined practice of legitimate medi-

¹ Dr Russell, in an address to one of the Homœopathic Congresses, adduced it as a “most gratifying reflection” to his homœopathic brethren, that “naturally” homœopathy “welcomed,” and could include within it, other forms of quackery in medicine (its “cognate sciences and curative methods” as he delicately termed them), such as hydropathy and mesmeric cures, etc.—See *Journal of Homœopathy* for 1851, p. 569.

² Provincial Medical and Surgical Journal, 1851, p. 444.

cine and homœopathy, as a practice which he thinks "no man without a compromise of his character can adopt." "No casuistry," says he, "can justify or explain away such double-dealing; and all moralists will agree that 'if a man represents as true what he believes to be untrue, or even doubtful, he tells a falsehood, and that if he does it from interested motives, he is a dishonest man.'" ¹

Hahnemann himself seems to have entertained an opinion rather analogous to that of Mr Brodribb, regarding the gross impropriety, and indeed impossibility, of combining the two forms of practice, and of using allopathic means as auxiliary to homœopathy and infinitesimal doses. "It is impossible (he observes) that there can be another true, best method of curing dynamic diseases (*i. e.*, all diseases not strictly surgical), besides homœopathy, just as it is impossible to draw more than one straight line betwixt two given points. He who imagines that there are other modes of curing diseases besides it, could not have appreciated the fundamental character of homœopathy, nor practised it with sufficient care, nor could he ever have seen or read cases of properly performed homœopathic cures; nor, on the other hand, could he have discerned the baselessness of all allopathic modes of treating diseases, and their bad or even dreadful effects, if, with such lax indifference, he places the only true healing art on an equality with those hurtful methods of treatment, or alleges them to be AUXILIARIES to homœopathy which it could not dispense with. My true, conscientious followers, the pure homœopaths, with their successful, almost never-failing treatment, might teach these persons better."² When elsewhere

¹ Pamphlet, p. 45. Perhaps many will consider as still more deserving of such a sentence, the conduct which some homœopathic students and practitioners have followed in obtaining licences and diplomas under the guise of being followers of the doctrines and practice of legitimate medicine. "To use all arts," as observed by the *Medical Times*, "to gain admission to a body, and thereafter to vilify and affect to despise it—to profess certain opinions, in order to acquire a professional status, and, when the status is acquired, to ridicule and denounce them—to swear adherence to a profession, in order to acquire the right to practise it, and thereafter to embrace a professional heresy, the more successfully to pander to the follies of the rich and the fashionable—to adhere neither to the one nor to the other, but to practice either, as the absence of all principle admits, and the whim or caprice of a patient demands—these are the achievements of this modern philosophy—these the triumphs of homœopathic morality."—*Medical Times*, Oct. 11, 1851.

² Organon, p. 206. "I remember," says a homœopathic writer (Dr Scott of Glasgow), "having proposed the question to the venerable founder of our method (whom we, a disjointed band, follow at so great an interval, and with such tottering

speaking of giving doses sufficiently minute and infinitesimal, or "as small as possible," (decillionths) Hahnemann, in the same spirit, observes—"an unnecessarily larger dose of even an accurately homœopathic medicine, acts too violently, and, at first, produces too great and too lasting a disturbance of the mind and disposition, to allow us soon to perceive the improvement in them. I must here," he continues, "observe, that this so essential rule is chiefly transgressed by presumptuous tyros in homœopathy, and by physicians who are converted to homœopathy from the ranks of the old school. From old prejudices, these persons abhor the smallest doses of the highest dilutions of medicines, in such cases, and hence they fail to experience the great advantages and blessings of that mode of proceeding which a thousandfold experience has shown to be the most salutary; they cannot effect all that homœopathy is capable of doing, and hence they have no claim to be considered its adherents."¹

Elsewhere, as if in further explanation of this statement, Hahnemann tells us, that medicine applied in accordance with the law of *similia similibus*, "restores the patient to perfect health without suffering, and in a short time, and thus it is a salutary and blessed business." "For," says he, "homœopathy sheds not a drop of blood; administers no emetics, purgatives, laxatives, or diaphoretics; drives off no external affection by external means; prescribes no warm baths nor medicated clysters; applies no spanish flies nor mustard plasters," etc.²

In one of his early works, Hahnemann had advised the application of a plaster to the back, and the use of electricity in paralytic affections. In the last edition of his *Organon* (1833) he tells us "that, as both of these appliances have furnished"—to use his own

and unequal steps), whether in *any* case we ought to resort to *bleeding*? He answered with his wonted animation, '*Jamais, Jamais*;' and in further conversation on the subject, he came to the conclusion that if the homœopathic physician could not dispense with this operation, '*C'est un mauvais homœopathe*.'

"I think (adds Dr Scott, with unusual homœopathic honesty) we (homœopaths) are taught by every day's experience to walk with increasing humility, and to treat with increasing respect and courtesy those who have not received what we reckon the *universal law of cure*, but whose resources we are constrained from time to time to borrow; and, in general, when *practicable*, I would suggest it to be highly expedient when our methods fail, and we are in consequence inclined, or rather constrained, to adopt others, that we should consign the case to a practitioner of the ordinary school."—*British Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. vii. p. 558.

¹ *Organon*, p. 306.

² Preface to "*Organon*," p. xi.

words—"the bastard homœopathists with an excuse for their allopathic transgressions, I am grieved (he contritely adds) that I ever should have proposed them; and I hereby solemnly retract them:—for this reason also, that, since then, our homœopathic system has advanced SO NEAR TO PERFECTION that they are now no longer required."¹

Many medical practitioners could give painful evidence as to the sad and irremediable results which have often accrued from an implicit adherence to the principles of homœopathy and infinitesimal doses, as laid down by Hahnemann, in diseases and cases in which proper medicinal means were actually required. It would be an easy task to adduce from various legitimate physicians abundant evidence of disease and suffering being prolonged, and danger and death being unnecessarily risked, in deference to the nullities and phantasies of homœopathy. But instead of creating any unnecessary irritation by adducing such evidence, let us simply cite a homœopathic physician as a witness of the fact; and his evidence at least will, I hope, be allowed to be unchallengeable. Among the homœopathic practitioners of England, there are few men, perhaps, of more talent, or at least of more honesty, than Dr Madden. Listen to the results which he himself has seen accrue from a blind adherence to Hahnemann's principles. I quote from a paper of Dr Madden's, "On the Use of Auxiliaries," published in the "Homœopathic Journal" for 1849, p. 314:—

"About a year ago," says Dr Madden, "I was consulted by a lady who had been long an invalid, and had latterly been treated according to our system; her attendant, however, was among the most rigid adherents to all the dogmas of our great master, and accordingly he allowed no other means beside an occasional lavement to be employed to overcome the great tendency to constipation under which she laboured. By degrees the enema lost its effect, and she was then directed to increase the quantity used, and the frequency of its employment. A number of pelvic symptoms, which at this time manifested themselves, were attributed by her attendant to uterine congestion, and she continued under his care. When I first saw her she was exceedingly weak, complained of constant dragging pains in the back, which prevented her taking almost any exercise, and the bowels never showed any symptoms of acting, unless she took two or three enemas, consisting of a quart each. On examination, I found that though the uterus was slightly congested, it was by no means sufficiently so to account for her symptoms; whereas the rectum was enor-

¹ Preface to *Organon*, p. xii. At the same time, it may be proper to add, that in cases of poisoning with belladonna berries, etc., he allows of the propriety of emetics (*Organon*, p. 113), and of stimulants in asphyxia, etc.,—these and surgical cases not coming, as he and his followers argue, within the province of a law such as homœopathy, intended for the cure of medical diseases.

mously enlarged, extending entirely across the posterior wall of the pelvis, and being fully three times its natural size. *That this most unpleasant morbid condition is traceable to the treatment, I think there can be little doubt.*"

Dr Madden gives the following details of another case, in which the effects were (to use his own words) "still more disastrous,"—palsy of the lower part of the body, supervening in consequence:—

"An elderly gentleman," Dr Madden states, "who had lived freely, and suffered much from gout, was induced to consult a homœopathist, on account of the shattered condition of his general health. As he had been transgressing the laws of health in many ways, the first effects of the treatment were decidedly beneficial, as his medical man enforced temperance and regularity. But after a time, the system began to succumb under the too rigid abstinence which had been recommended, and the bowels ceased to respond to the homœopathic remedies; and the medical man, fearing that one or two slight divergences from the strictest homœopathic rules were the cause of this failure, urged a still closer adherence to every particular; and the result was, that, after a few weeks of unsuccessful treatment, *an attack of paraplegia* ensued, which has proved incurable. . . . I feel satisfied that the paraplegic attack might have been delayed, if not warded off, had the patient been put upon a more liberal diet, and occasional mild aperients administered when necessary."¹

It is sometimes urged as a reason for temporarily trusting to homœopathy and its infinitesimal doses, that the trial of this practice and of these medicines will at least do no harm, provided it does no good. But the *omission* of due remedial measures is very often accompanied with injury, and it may be, and doubtlessly often is, irreparable injury; for under such inane and negative means as infinitesimal homœopathic doses the disease is allowed to march onwards in its course while the trial is making; and when other active and proper means are at last had recourse to, the aid may come too late to save the patient from a long convalescence, or too late even to save him from death. It is quite true that (as is already stated in a preceding chapter, p. 80), in a very large number of cases and affections, nature is perfectly adequate to restore the patient without the aid of drugs. "In 1000 common ailments (says Dr Moore),² though *no* remedies were used, probably not above two or three would prove fatal. And if all were treated by a physician who ordered *nothing* injurious, he might acquire by the results considerable credit. Even should all those cases have fallen into the hands

¹ Dr Madden in "British Journal of Homœopathy," No. xxiii. p. 315.

² History of the Practice of Vaccination (1817), p. 54. Thus (to quote again the same writer), it happened that "the properties of amulets have ever been maintained on the grounds of *EXPERIENCE*, on the very principles of Bacon's philosophy; as the fortunate possessed usually escaped death many times, and never died but *once*."—P. 59. See the foot-note to a preceding page (p. 81).

of an ignorant impostor, though the salutary operations of nature should have been weakened or counteracted by his interference, and ten or twenty actually destroyed, he might still have a pretext for boasting of having CURED 980 or 990 sick persons.”¹ But though the unaided powers of nature are thus in many instances quite adequate to avert lingering disease or death, they fail to do so in other cases and in other diseases. We have already seen (p. 112) that the proportion of deaths in pneumonia, for example, is strictly regulated by the day or date of the disease at which proper remedial measures are adopted; that the mortality ensuing upon this malady is comparatively very small when the patients are submitted *early* to due medical treatment; and that, on the contrary, its attendant mortality becomes greater and greater in proportion as they delay longer and longer in subjecting themselves to that treatment. We have seen also (pp. 110 and 111) how, in those that did recover, the rapidity of the disappearance of different symptoms, and the total *duration* of the convalescence, was regulated also by the date of the adoption of appropriate treatment. If it be argued, then, that the omission of this appropriate treatment is justifiable in cases of disease, and that homœopathy, “if it does no good, can do no harm,” we would beg to reply to such sophistry in the words used by Dr Beddoes, half a century ago,² in reference to another practice. “But if it does no good, it CAN DO HARM (writes Dr Beddoes), all possible harm,—provided in killing there be harm. It can (he continues) arrest the rescuing hand till the silent but progressive finger of fate move from ‘*time is*’ to ‘*time is no more.*’ There are (Dr B. adds) plenty of occasions on which water-gruel, upon the harmless principle, will thus do a man’s business, just as effectually as laurel water.”

¹ Dr Moore’s remarks apply to the milder forms of human ailments. In malignant cholera, for instance, about 1 in 3 dies; in small-pox, 1 in 5 in some epidemics; in pneumonia we have seen 1 in 13 dying when the disease was not interfered with by medicine (see p. 105). Again, we have also seen that, in the practice of the army and navy (where appropriate treatment is early and actively applied), the same disease proves fatal in about 1 in every 28 cases; and in some of the returns from the public services, the mortality in pneumonia is scarcely above 2 in every 100 attacked with that malady.

² Essays Moral and Medical, vol. i., 2d Essay, p. 21.

CHAPTER XIX.

PATRONAGE OF MEDICAL QUACKERIES; AGGRAVATIONS FOLLOWING HOMŒOPATHIC DOSES, AND ERRORS OF PATIENTS AS TO THEIR EFFECTS; RATIONALE OF HOMŒOPATHY; SUPERSENSIBILITY OF DISEASED PARTS; IDIOSYNCRACIES, ETC.

MANKIND seem capable of thinking and reasoning more accurately upon almost every other kind of practical art and science than they do in regard to medicine. Neither lawyers themselves, nor the public, would listen, for instance, for a moment to any astounding quackery in law. Suppose any law-reformer should undertake to prove that a payment by an "infinitesimal" mustard seed or straw was quite equal in its legal amount and potency to a round sum in gold, would he not be rated not merely as illogical, but as actually insane? The same character, I believe, would be accorded to any quack-agriculturist who should rise up at the present time and declare, that during the past thousands of years the true science of agriculture has remained totally mistaken and undiscovered, and that *one grain* of guano, or of phosphate of ammonia, or of other manures, if properly diluted and shaken in an ocean of fluid as large as the Baltic or Mediterranean seas, would form a mixture of "terrific potency" (to borrow the language of the homœopathists) for fertilizing the soils, not only of a single farm, but of whole counties and kingdoms. Or what character would the world attribute to any politician, who should gravely propound that our paupers and others need not be longer a heavy pecuniary burden upon the poor-rates or the state, as he had discovered a cheap and "infallible" law or method of permanently supporting each and all of them upon—an infusion of a few grains of curry-powder?

In relation to such subjects, in the practical arts and sciences of law, agriculture, politics, etc., the public mind readily enough perceives the exquisitely ridiculous character of any such charlatanic

phantasies and delusions. But all past history and all modern history alike show that, in relation to medicine as a practical art and science, the matter stands widely different. For every few years some reformer or another has sprung up (and presuming upon the ignorance of the public in relation to the complex vital laws of health and disease), has roundly declared that the true nature and true treatment of human disease were unknown till his time, and that it has been left to him and to his sagacity to discover at last a new infallible cure, or a new infallible system of cure, for the various ailments of mankind. And all past as well as present experience further shows, that the greater the degree of dogmatism and effrontery with which any such medical pretender proclaims his doctrine, and the greater also the abuse which he bestows upon the medical profession at large, the greater, in all probability, will be his success in gaining patients and patrons amongst the credulous public. Nay, sometimes, apparently the more there is of irrationality in any new or revived charlatanic medical doctrine or practice, the more converts it is likely to gain; provided only its proposer and his credulous patrons show no scruples of conscience in suggesting and promulgating its imaginary cures. The designing pretender of the new doctrine may further be a person totally unacquainted with physiology, or pathology, or medical science in any way, and yet all past experience shows that this is no reason why he should not fully and at once be trusted as a medical practitioner by the public, if he only boldly and unhesitatingly declares himself to have detected some "new gift of healing."¹ The kind of credulity, I repeat, which the public thus show daily in relation to medicine they show in relation to no other practical art or science. Indeed, if, as I have already remarked, a similar species of charlatanry were attempted in relation to most other arts and sciences, the delusion would be at once detected, and the imposture duly denounced; whilst, in medicine, the delusion would, on the other hand, probably make the propounder's fame and fortune, and in the course of years be forgotten.

¹ I am informed by a physician (Dr Sleight), to whom St John Long was induced to apply for instruction after his first trial for manslaughter, that he found him (even for a layman and non-professional man) utterly and most strangely ignorant on everything whatever, however elementary, relating to the structure, functions, and diseases of the body. Yet by that time Long's rubbings and liniments had, it was said, gained for him L.100,000 out of the pockets of the credulous public of London; and noblemen, clergymen, generals, etc., stood forward at his two trials to attest and swear to his great medical knowledge.

“Have not (says Dr Marshall Hall) ALL systems had their brief day, and then failed hitherto?” “What,” he asks, “should we think of an ignorant peasant turning quack engineer? I do indeed (he remarks) remember to have seen persons, when their watch would not go, give it a good shake; and once or twice this coarse mode of watch-therapeutics may have succeeded in removing some unknown obstacle to its movements, and the little machine may have resumed its horological career. Such a lucky accident in experiments on the human frame and its diseases, has made the fortune of a quack in medicine. Yet would any one in his senses deliberately deliver over his watch to the issue of such an experiment? Would not the shake be more likely to move the displaced pivot still further from its proper position in the *many* wrong directions, than to replace it in the *one* right one? Yet to such experiments—to such violent and ignorant experiments—many entrust the well-being of that most complicated and delicate of all machines, that ‘harp of a thousand strings,’ the human frame!”¹

The curious amount of true folly often betrayed by the credulous public, in thus patronising new and pretended universal methods of cure, can only fully be appreciated by physicians who are acquainted with the actual nature of the diseases which are to be cured; or by others, who, if not physicians, may for a moment give themselves the trouble of considering and mastering the pretensions of the new empiricism, whatever it may be. I have quoted in a preceding page (p. 79), from Sir Benjamin Brodie, an account of a London empiric, who, some years ago, rose into rapid practice in consequence of alleging that he had made a great discovery in the healing art, viz., that mere dry rubbing or shampooing, in his particular way, was a remedy for all disorders. No doubt the simple rubbing or shampooing of the surface, such as this quack practised, is one useful means of treatment; and has been generally recognised by the profession in all ages as such in some particular cases; as where there is stiffness of the apparatus of motion from disuse, and from the slighter forms of functional disease and injury. No doubt, also, the whole class of “*malades imaginaires*,” and hypochondriac artists, lawyers, old ladies, and others, suffering from the mere effects of sedentary habits and want of sufficient physical exercise, may have their health improved by being forced once or oftener for an hour or so daily (under the name of shampooing) to exert muscles and parts to which they would not otherwise give due healthy exercise, and to have the surfaces of their skin cleansed and excited by it. But, to imagine, as this London empiric and his patrons alleged, that rubbing the skin would cure the various internal diseases of the abdomen, chest, eyes, ears,

¹ Practical Observations and Suggestions in Medicine, p. 9.

spinal cord, etc., for which he applied his frictions and pinchings, is an absurdity of which even an unprejudiced child might see the true character. The practice was applied, for instance (to take one example only), in cases in which one or other side of the body was entirely palsied, in consequence of previous attacks of hemorrhagic apoplexy. Such an apoplectic attack produces, as is well known, that palsy of the side which follows it, by injury of the opposite hemisphere of the brain, from an effusion or effusions of clots of blood into the substance, or upon the surface of the brain. To dream and fancy, that in such a case, the disease could really be removed by merely rubbing and shampooing the skin, is to suppose, that this rubbing or shampooing of the skin could remove a clot of blood situated in the interior of the head, or mend the local injuries of the brain left by that clot. The watchmaker might as well expect to mend the broken wheel or mainspring of a watch by rubbing the surface of the glass face or gold back of the watch, as a rational man could expect to rectify the lesions and injuries producing a hemiplegic side, by rubbing the patient's surface. And certainly a quack engineer might as sanely imagine, that he could rectify the diversified derangements and injuries that are apt to take place in the interior of a locomotive engine, by merely rubbing and burnishing the surface of the shell or casement of the locomotive, as a medical practitioner could expect to cure the lesions of the interior of the human body by rubbing the surface of the body.¹

One other strange circumstance seems to hold true of *all* types and forms of medical quackery, viz.,—that the victims and patrons of it are generally ready to assert, in the most uncompromising terms, and even to swear to, all kinds of improbabilities and impossibilities in regard to its effects. Thus (as I have already quoted

¹ The case of the rubbing empiric, described by Sir Benjamin, illustrates another curious general fact in the history of such practices—namely, the unbounded sums that the public will freely and ardently pay to such medical pretenders, while, at the same time, they often grudge the educated medical practitioner his comparatively infinitesimal fees. In the notice of this London rubber, it is stated, for instance, that—"A young lady, whose lower limbs had been paralytic from infancy, was brought to him from the country to be cured. At the end of a year, £500 having been expended in the experiment, she returned home in the same state as when she had left it; but promises were made to her that if the process were repeated, it would produce the desired effect *at last*; and she came to London again for the purpose. The result was such as might have been anticipated"—namely, some pecuniary benefit to the impostor, but—no medical benefit whatever to the patient.—See anteriorly, footnote, p. 79; and *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxxi. p. 91.

from Dr Curie, at p. 37), among the numerous witnesses, Nobles, Generals, etc., brought forward by Mr St John Long, at his trial for manslaughter, in consequence of his applications and rubbing, Lord Ingestre swore, "that he saw St John Long draw several pints of a liquid like mercury from a patient's brain," viz., the brain, I believe, of the late Sir F——s B—d—t. And I have at the same time (p. 36), cited Hartley, the metaphysician, as gravely and seriously publishing to the world an account of his own cure, and of the supposed cure of 150 others, by Mrs Steven's absurd specific, the fact being—that he himself, and no doubt most of the other 150, died of the very disease of which he gravely and publicly avowed himself and them to be thus cured. No doubt, also, many of these 150, like Dr Hartley, cozened themselves, and tried to cozen others into the belief, that they were cured of their maladies, when such was not in any degree the fact. "For there is," observes a late medical writer, "a strong inclination in mankind generally to *assist* in propagating an imposition to which they have themselves yielded; both because it makes them objects of interest to the public, and because it appears to justify them in having given it their confidence."¹ They are in consequence, often indiscreetly, and almost unwittingly, led to asseverate as true, about such new practices, things which have no actual foundation in sober truth. We have already quoted Dr Moore as correctly observing, in relation to this very curious trait in human nature, that "Clergymen, Judges, and Peers are daily *swearing* that they have been cured of incurable diseases; but the meanest apothecary smiles with contempt when he reads their splendid testimonials. . . . Yet, if any one should attempt, by investigating each particular case, to refute it, he would soon discover the impossibility of succeeding. I have been requested (he adds), on various occasions, to make such researches, and generally found that the patients were completely convinced of the truth of the attestation, whether the remedy was physic, magnetism, or a tractor. In short, they were ready to take *the most solemn oath* to what was quite impossible to be true!" (See antecedently, p. 81).

Almost all pretended new systems of medicine and cure, agree in one other respect. Whatever may be the original doctrine which has caught the imagination of the new reformer, and has been made by him the basis of his system, this original fundamental doctrine,

¹ Medical Gazette for 20th January 1843.

always betimes comes to be supported, enveloped in, and,—as it is sometimes termed,—“proved,” by other additional doctrines. The original primary fancy, or supposed primary fact, requires to be duly clothed in other secondary fancies and “facts” of the same kind, in order that the whole may come out under the appearance of a consistent creed. Even the poor rubber, for example, has pretended synovial deposits to rub down in parts where no synovia ever existed; he has to clear away synovial swellings around the trunks of nerves going to weak limbs, and finds, or pretends to find, on the bodies of his patients these swellings in localities where every tyro in anatomy knows there are no nervous trunks; he sets himself deliberately to rub down the natural projections and tuberosities on the bones, as if any amount of rubbing could enable him to change the necessary forms which Nature has given to the skeleton, etc.; he declares indigestions and cancers, cataracts and amauroses, congenitally deformed or idiotic brains, and sprained thumbs, to be all equally cases of displaced or deranged synovia, and to be affections all equally curable by external manipulations; and he cozens his victims into the belief, that the normal swellings of bones, glands, etc., are anormal and diseased, and can and must be discussed by pinching and shampooing the surface,—the whole constituting a medical doctrine that any rational man unacquainted with the histories of past medical quackeries, would, *a priori*, suppose to form an imposture, which the intellect even of a South Sea savage could easily enough see through and despise; but yet all past medical experience amply and humiliatingly shows that even such a crude medical creed, and even such a gross medical deception as this, can always for a time get patrons and enthusiastic promulgators among those educated but weak-minded patrons of quackery in civilised England, who are ever ready to adopt every new extravagance in medicine (and sometimes in religion too), and ever ready also to asseverate and swear to all kinds of untrue and impossible cures in attestation of that which, at the time, happens to be their own latest form of medical credulity. In respect of subordinate creeds and subsidiary hypotheses, the doctrine and system of homœopathy is but a modern repetition of the history of a hundred other infallible doctrines and systems of cure which have been propounded and disappeared before it. And like several of them, it is as extravagant in some of these its minor doctrines and details, as it is in its primary foundation.

The “infallible law,” *similia similibus curantur*, came in Hahnemann’s mind to embrace within it and under it, a number of minor laws or doctrines of more or less importance to the original dogma itself. In the present and following chapter I propose to notice briefly, the principal of these minor tenets in homœopathy ; but particularly Hahnemann’s doctrine regarding medicinal aggravations,—his tenets relative to the super-sensibility of diseased parts to infinitesimal medicines,—his deductions regarding the action of medicine from observations on the idiosyncracies of individuals,—his doctrine relative to the repetition of doses,—his rationale of the homœopathic method of cure, etc.

1. *Doctrine of Medicinal Aggravations, and Mistakes of Patients in Judging of Effects of Infinitesimal Doses.*

Patients who are taking homœopathic globules or drugs, either of their own accord or by the prescription of homœopathic practitioners, constantly talk of them producing effects upon themselves which these drugs, however, ought not to produce. They speak of observing consequences from them in their own persons, and in their own experience, which very consequences ought never to follow their use according to Hahnemann and the whole spirit of the infallible homœopathic law. Nay, the very occurrence of these effects, which such individuals often deem incontrovertible proof of the utility and proper action of the drugs, is (however unwittingly to themselves) the most incontrovertible of all evidence that they have in truth *not* been at all influenced or affected by the homœopathic globules which they may have smelled or swallowed.

When suffering under slight headache, cough, etc., for example, homœopathic patients ever and anon state, that the globules which they received from their homœopathic practitioner had the effect of relieving them in a few hours by an active perspiration, catharsis, or other form of evacuation ; and they innocently and confidently attribute their salutary diaphoresis, diarrhœa, diuresis, etc., to the action of the drug which they had swallowed, and appeal to this as indubitable evidence of the efficacy of the infinitesimal globule. It is evidence, however, of two things perfectly the reverse, viz., first, either (what was very probable) that nature was throwing off the disease in these ways (as by diaphoresis, for example), or perhaps the bath they had used, the heat of the bed, or the fluid they had swallowed,

was acting as a sudorific; or, secondly, that the drug given to them and swallowed by them was some sufficiently active form of allopathic diaphoretic, cathartic, etc., surreptitiously given (as described in the last chapter) under the guise of a homœopathic globule or tincture. For, a proper infinitesimal homœopathic dose in such cases can, and ought, according to the whole spirit of Hahnemann's exposition and experience, to have no such active effect as the production of diaphoresis, or other evacuation; but ought merely to make the patient "grow hourly better," by the simple *disappearance*, after a time, of the symptoms of the disease, without any discharge by the skin, etc., or any special disturbance whatever in the functions of other parts than those primarily affected. Under the action of a proper homœopathic drug, no *new* symptoms or affections, such as diaphoresis, diarrhœa, etc., should appear to be produced. The old or *pre-existing* symptoms only are modified by it; and not new symptoms created by it. "For when an appropriate homœopathic globule is given (says Hahnemann), the disease, if it be not one of a very long standing, will generally be removed and extinguished by the first dose of it, without any considerable disturbance. I say without any considerable disturbance, for in the employment of the most appropriate homœopathic remedy, it is *only the symptoms of the medicine that correspond to the symptoms of the disease* that are called into play, the former occupying the place of the latter (weaker) in the organism, and thereby annihilating them by superiority of power; but the **OTHER SYMPTOMS** of the homœopathic medicine, which are often very numerous, being in no way applicable to the case of disease in question, do **NOT** appear at all. The patient growing hourly better, feels almost nothing of them at all, because the excessively minute dose requisite for homœopathic use is much too weak to produce the *other symptoms of the medicine that are NOT HOMŒOPATHIC to the case* in those parts of the body that are free from disease."¹

Nay, the very production of any *new* symptoms or effects, such as diaphoresis, diarrhœa, diuresis, etc., by any medicine given, is, according to Hahnemann, not merely not a homœopathic result of a homœopathic dose, but, on the contrary, if it were accidentally a result of such a dose, it would work *harm* instead of good to the patient. "Every medicine (says Hahnemann) prescribed for a

¹ Organon, p. 235.

case of disease which, in the course of its action, produces a *new* and troublesome symptom not appertaining to the disease to be cured, is not capable of effecting real improvement, and cannot be considered as homœopathically selected;"¹ and every aggravation by the production of such *new* symptoms, shows the medicine to be "ill-selected" and not homœopathic, and "invariably proves unsuitableness" on the part of the drug.² Nature, Hahnemann allows, sometimes "herself cures disease by a crisis or increased activity in some neighbouring organ or surface, as 'vomiting, purging, diaphoresis, diuresis,' etc.; but then (he adds) it is only by the destruction and sacrifice of a portion of the organism itself that unaided nature (thus) can save the patient in acute diseases, and, if death do not ensue, restore, though only slowly and imperfectly, the harmony of life—health." But, he farther avers, that homœopathy should overpower and subdue diseases, both acute and chronic, "directly and without such *sacrifices*," as diaphoresis, diarrhœa, etc.³ And if the homœopathic medicine given be so strong as to produce such *new* symptoms, as "vomiting, diarrhœa, fever, perspiration, and so forth, little or no good towards curing the disease will be thereby accomplished; ON THE CONTRARY, *the patient* (Hahnemann avers), *will be thereby perceptibly weakened*, and for a long time the administration of even the smallest dose of the same remedy must not be thought of, if we would not wish to injure the patient."⁴

Again, medical men are sometimes told that the swallowing of this or of that homœopathic remedy, at once and instantly began to relieve the patient of the symptoms for which it was exhibited; and that the symptoms of the affection were forthwith and directly *abated* and *diminished*. I have heard it further upheld, that this rapid and happy result could not be a mental effect of the globules, as it was specially seen and observable in sick infants when treated homœopathically; and in whose cases no belief, hope, or other mental influence, could be supposed to produce the result. Every one who has watched the natural course of diseases in infancy, when no remedies are given, has remarked the rapid phases and changes of alternating amelioration and aggravation repeatedly and constantly taking place in them. Frequent remittance, and consequent in-

¹ Organon, p. 300.² Ibid, p. 303.³ Ibid, p. 129 and p. 28.⁴ Ibid, p. 290.

crease of symptoms, is a well-known peculiarity in most of the diseases of infancy, and more particularly in those accompanied with any degree of fever. And that any changes occurring in the *abatement* and amelioration of the symptoms in their diseases, immediately after the homœopathic globules are swallowed, are changes independent of the globules, is easily proved. Those, indeed, who adduce this abatement as an evidence of the *effect* of the homœopathic drug, make an utter mistake as to what the primary effect of the homœopathic drug ought to be. For, in the first instance, it ought to *exalt* and *aggravate* the existing symptoms, and not *abate* and *diminish* them. They believe that the globule has acted, because the symptoms are immediately and evidently decreased in severity. But if the homœopathic globule acted at all, the very reverse result should first follow, viz., an immediate and evident increase of the severity of the principal symptoms of the disease, whatever these symptoms are. In various febrile affections (to take them as an example) the homœopathic practitioner or homœopathic amateur often (though much against Hahnemannic and homœopathic rules) gives infinitesimal globules of aconite;¹ and from the pulse beginning to fall and the fever to disappear within the course of half an hour or longer, it has been often argued that such happy results were the homœopathic effects of the action of the aconite.

Every medical man knows, that many feverish attacks will, under rest and abstinence (two things which the homœopath always enjoins in such cases, in combination *with* the aconite) speedily and spontaneously disappear without any drug at all. And if the pulse fall

¹ Hahnemann recommends Aconite, when used, to be given in decillionth globules, or rather as a 1000th part of a decillionth; and adds, "it is rarely necessary to give another such dose thirty-six or forty-eight hours after the first."—*The Hahnemann Materia Medica*, p. 39. Mr Everest, his vaunted personal friend and pupil, tells us that a true application of the doctrine of homœopathy "excludes the use of Aconite in almost *every* case in which it is now employed by homœopathists."—*Sermon*, p. 12. "It may (he adds) be deduced from the 'Organon,' that Aconite should be very rarely used; that it is seldom wanted at all; that it almost always does MOST EXTENSIVE MISCHIEF by destroying the homœopathicity of the true remedy; and, in fact, except in cases of pure inflammatory fever, pneumonia, and one or two other disorders, should be cautiously avoided. Hahnemann indeed told me that, excepting in pure inflammatory fever, he knew no case where it was wanted. Now, look to all our manuals, read all our cases, and ask yourself what sort of system of medicine we are establishing. I assure you seriously, that, absurd as the old system is, it is not much more injurious than this, viz., homœopathy as practised by British homœopathic physicians and amateurs."—*Sermon*, p. 12.

and the other symptoms of the fever abate immediately or shortly after the dose of aconite, it is the most conclusive of all arguments that the change was owing to nature, or, at all events, *not to any homœopathic action of the aconite*. For, according to Hahnemann's own explicit and repeated evidence, and his own reiterated statement, and according to the whole spirit and tenor of the homœopathic method of cure, every homœopathic drug ought, in the first instance, and for a longer or shorter time, as an hour or longer, after its exhibition, to produce an AGGRAVATION or EXALTATION of the symptoms of the disease, and NOT *their relief and abatement*. The disease ought not to be immediately made better, but it ought to be made worse, in the first instance at all events, by the remedy employed; that is, if the drug acts homœopathically at all, and not antipathically. And those disciples who argue that the disease was made better under these circumstances, offer in fact the most conclusive evidence that the result was not a result of the homœopathic drug, but occurred altogether independently of the drug. This subject, however, is so important in relation to homœopathy, as to merit one or two additional observations and proofs.

And, *first*, let me remark, that the whole Hahnemannian theory of medicine presupposes that, in order that the disease under which any patient is labouring may be homœopathically removed and annihilated, the dose of drug exhibited must first produce in the patient "a medicinal disease somewhat STRONGER or GREATER than the malady to be cured."¹ This paramount principle in homœopathy is enunciated repeatedly by Hahnemann in different parts of his "Organon." The aim of homœopathic medicine is, as he states it, "by means of a similar affection developed by a homœopathically chosen remedy, to excite in it (the vital force) a medicinal disease somewhat GREATER in degree, so that the natural morbid affection can no longer act upon the vital force."²—"The similar artificial diseases excited by medicine are," he elsewhere observes, "STRONGER than the natural disease;" and in curing by medicines homœopathically, the practitioner "produces a disease very similar but *stronger*" than the natural disease. "The curative power of medicines, therefore, depends on their symptoms, similar to the disease, but SUPERIOR to it in strength."³ A disease (to quote another of his expressions of the same ruling principle) can be removed "solely by one that is similar

¹ Organon, p. 237.

Ibid, p. 41.

³ Ibid, p. 126.

in symptoms, and is somewhat *stronger*, according to eternal, unchangeable laws of nature, which have not hitherto been recognised.”¹

But, *secondly*, an important corollary flows from the preceding premise. For Hahnemann further reasons, and avers, that, in consequence of the use of a proper homœopathic remedy, *similar* to, but *stronger* than the existing disease, the disease itself of the patient, or its symptoms, are necessarily for a time INCREASED or EXALTED. Such in fact must inevitably be the natural result, provided the homœopathic dose were of any real efficacy at all. For, if the homœopathic dose tended, as it is supposed to do, to produce artificially the same or similar symptoms in the patient to those which already pre-existed, it must necessarily aggravate these pre-existing symptoms. In a case of pleurisy (to take the example we have already adduced), if the homœopathist had a remedy which could produce the four principal symptoms of pleurisy,—the fever, the pain in the side, the cough, and the difficult breathing,—the patient ought to suffer an exaltation or aggravation of the fever, and of the pain in the side, and of the cough, and of the difficult breathing, when, in addition to the amount of suffering which already existed from these symptoms as parts of the *natural* disease under which he was suffering, he employed a drug capable of exciting these symptoms as parts of the *curative* disease; seeing, indeed, it ought to *cause* them therapeutically, even if they had not existed at all previously as parts of the natural disease.

Hahnemann, in various parts of his work, has dwelt upon this therapeutic “aggravation” or “exaltation” of the symptoms by the homœopathic remedy. A homœopathically selected remedy, he observes, “usually immediately after ingestion, for the FIRST HOUR, or FOR A FEW HOURS, causes a kind of slight aggravation (where the dose has been somewhat too large, however, for a considerable number of hours), which has so much resemblance to the original disease that it seems to the patient to be an aggravation of his disease. But it is, in reality, nothing more than an extremely similar *medicinal disease*, somewhat exceeding in strength the original affection.”²

In fact, as we have seen in a preceding chapter,³ it was the fear of artificially and medicinally aggravating and exalting, by the similar drug employed, the existing symptoms of the disease to too great and dangerous, or even to a fatal amount, that first induced

¹ Organon, p. 151.

² Ibid, p. 237.

³ See Chap. v. p. 38.

Hahnemann to diminish the doses of his homœopathic drugs, and to have recourse at last to infinitesimal quantities only; in order that the resulting medicinal exaltation or aggravation of the symptoms might not rise to a severe or perilous degree. "The smaller," he observes, "the dose of the homœopathic remedy is, so much the slighter and shorter is this apparent increase of the disease during the first hours. But as the dose of a homœopathic remedy can scarcely ever be made so small that it shall not be able to relieve, overpower, indeed completely cure and annihilate the pure natural disease, of not very long standing, that is analogous to it, we can understand why a dose of an appropriate homœopathic medicine, not the very smallest possible, does ALWAYS, DURING THE FIRST HOUR AFTER ITS INGESTION, produce a perceptible homœopathic aggravation of this kind."¹ Again, in chronic cases where medicines of a more chronic action are given, he states that such *aggravations*,

¹ Organon, p. 238. These statements of Hahnemann, regarding the exaltation or aggravation of the existing symptoms of the disease by an infinitesimal dose of a well-selected and appropriate homœopathic remedy, are laid down with all his usual strong asseverations and dogmatism. At a meeting of the Homœopathic Medical Society in London some time ago, one of the attending homœopathists declared, that he had only seen an aggravation in *one* case, and that in an instance where the homœopathic medicine employed was, according to the homœopathists themselves, no medicine at all—for it only consisted of sugar of milk altogether undrugged.—*British Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. v. p. 352. In referring to the practice of the Leipsic Hospital, as bearing on these aggravations, Dr Black remarks, "It appears not a little extraordinary that they now see nothing of these aggravations, of which only two years previously they were able to produce several examples."—*Black's Principles of Homœopathy*, p. 14. Schneider (another homœopathic authority) believes, "the so-called homœopathic aggravation to be either a one-sided medicinal action on certain parts, caused by the powerful character of the dose, or spontaneous aggravation of the disease, or the excitation that sometimes precedes the crisis, or an apparent aggravation of certain symptoms, or 'the physical effect of the homœopathic theory,' that is to say—*fancy*."—*British Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. vii. p. 335. Other homœopathists have expressed a similar scepticism regarding the doctrine of homœopathic aggravation. Thus Schrön calls the homœopathic aggravation an "unfortunate dogma;" and Schneider denominates it "a phantom."—*Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. vii. p. 334. But to surrender the doctrine of aggravations from homœopathic doses even though no aggravations can be proved to be seen, would certainly be surrendering the doctrine of homœopathic action of the drugs used. "To deny," lately observes Dr Beilby, "the frequent occurrence of medicinal aggravations, is to reject what, to my mind is, the ONLY conclusive evidence of the curative efficacy of infinitesimal quantities of medicine; for it is only by the occurrence of aggravations that the effects of the medicines are certainly manifested, and it is only by watching the relation of the medicinal aggravation of the symptoms to the amelioration which ensues, that we are assured of their curative efficacy, and

or "apparent increase of the symptoms of the original disease, lasting for one or several hours, may be perceived even for "many days" after the globule is swallowed. "When (Hahnemann further observes) I here limit the so-called homœopathic aggravation, or rather the primary action of the homœopathic medicine that seems to INCREASE in some degree the symptoms of the original disease, to the first, or few first hours, this is certainly true with respect to diseases of a more acute character and of recent origin; but where medicines of long action have to combat a malady of considerable, or of very long standing, where one dose, consequently, must continue to act for many days, we then see, during the first six, eight, or ten days, occasionally some such primary actions of the medicine, some such apparent increase of the symptoms of the original disease, (lasting for ONE or SEVERAL hours) make their appearance, whilst in the intervening hours amelioration of the whole malady is perceptible. After the lapse of these few days, the amelioration resulting from such primary action of the medicine, proceeds almost uninterruptedly for several days longer."¹

Rationale of the Homœopathic Mode of Cure

In explanation of the supposed curative action of his medicines, Hahnemann maintained the doctrine, that the "instinctive vital force" is, when a new medicinal disease is created, "*compelled* to direct an increased amount of energy" against the medicinal disease, and thus "soon overcomes it;"—the medicinal disease thus first overcoming the natural disease, and the instinctive vital force then speedily overcoming the remaining medicinal disease; so that the vital force "is now at last freed from the artificial (medicinal) one, and hence is enabled again to carry on healthily the vital operations of the organism."²

are able to meet the objection of the allopath, that our cures are the work of nature. In the words of Dr Scott, 'to deny the existence of medicinal aggravations, at the same time to acknowledge the curative efficacy of infinitesimal doses, seems to be equivalent to asserting, either that the labour of thus far reducing the quantity of medicine is unnecessary, or that the practitioner never errs in selecting the due proportions, though his choice may lie between the incalculable range of proportions from the crude mass to the thirtieth dilution.'"—*Journal of Homœopathy*, for April 1852, p. 304. And Boehm denies a physician (Schmid) to be a homœopathist who rejects the idea of medicinal aggravations.—*Æster, Zeitschrift für Homœopathie*, vol. iii. p. 384.

¹ *Organon*, p. 239.

² *Ibid*, p. 128.

In another explanation, he treats his disciples to a military illustration of the cure of diseases homœopathically by similar artificial or medicinal diseases. "The vital force," he observes, "advances against the hostile disease, and yet no enemy can be overcome, except by a *superior* power. The homœopathic medicine alone can supply the vital principle with this superior power." And he further states, that the vital force "opposes to the advancing hostile disease only a weak resistance, and as the disease progresses and increases in intensity, a greater resistance, but (at best) one that is only equal to the hostile attack, in delicate patients not even equal, often only weaker; for, offering an overpowering, an unhurtful opposition, it is not capable, not intended, not created. But if, by means of the action upon it by homœopathic medicines, we physicians can represent and *oppose* to this instinctive vital force its enemy, the disease, as it were, increased—however little increased—and if, in this manner, we magnify to the perception of the vital principle the picture of its enemy, the disease, by homœopathic medicines that produce an imitation of the original disease, of illusive resemblance to it, we thereby, by degrees, cause and *compel* this instinctive vital force gradually to increase its energy, and to go on always increasing it more and more, until at length it becomes much stronger than the original disease was, so that it can again become the autocrat in its own organism,"¹ etc.

Truly this explanation or rationale of Hahnemann implies the strangest contradictions. For how (asks Dr Wolf) can it be reconciled with common sense, that the vital powers are *too weak* and insufficient to remove any natural disease, or its symptoms, be they ever so trifling, without the aid of a homœopathic drug, but are nevertheless *sufficiently powerful* to remove the greater (stronger 'superior') drug sickness which is left after the natural disease is extinguished? Can any one comprehend that a power should be capable of overcoming a large obstacle, be incapable of removing, at the same time, a similar and comparatively much smaller one?

Or to state the explanation of the homœopathic law otherwise,²

¹ Organon, p. 130.

² Hahnemann himself adduces an instance like that supposed of homœopathic cure by "physical action," in the case of an effusion and pressure of blood, produced by a blow upon the forehead,—and the effects of which, he avers, *should* cure, homœopathically, by a kind of infinitesimal pressure with the soft thumb. "The injury," says Hahnemann, "resulting from a blow on the forehead with a hard substance (a painful tumour) is soon diminished in pain and swelling by pressing on

let us suppose the instinctive vital force to be loaded with a certain amount or weight of disease. Let us say, for the sake of illustration, that this weight of disease amounts to 100 grains. Replace, according to Hahnemann, this 100 grains weight (the force of the natural disease) by the weight of a similar artificial disease somewhat *greater* (say 110 grains), and two most strange phenomena will follow :—

1st. The similar artificial disease of 110 grains, when added to the natural disease of 100, does not increase the diseased load upon the “instinctive vital force” to 210 grains; but, on the other hand, it only “causes and compels” the instinctive vital force to increase its salutary energy till the natural disease or load of 100 is removed, and till nothing but the artificial load of 110 is left.

And 2d (what is much more marvellous still), the “instinctive vital force” of the constitution which could not throw off the previous diseased weight of 100 grains, throws off, under the infinitesimal dose, not only the old weight of 100 grains, but also the new and greater weight of 110 grains.

Is it possible to conceive a doctrine more matchlessly absurd than this? The “instinctive vital force” cannot, according to Hahnemann, re-act with success against the natural disease, which, for the sake of illustration, we have taken to be equal to the power of 100; and yet it can re-act successfully both against it, and against an artificial disease having the power of 110. But, if the power of 100 could not “cause and *compel* this instinctive vital force to *increase* its energy,” so as to throw off that amount of load, how could the new additional load of 110 excite it into a sufficient action, not only to throw this new weight off, but to overcome and reject both the new weight and the old?

It is perhaps unnecessary to add, that Hahnemann, after all, offers no kind of reason for his idea of a medicinal disease “*compelling*” the vital force to expel the natural disease; the whole is an attempt to solve the *ignotum per ignotius*; and he takes for granted in this explanation, that the vital force *could* always overcome an artificial disease, though it could not overcome a similar natural disease, and that even though the artificial disease was “stronger” and “greater” than the natural. But, observes Dr Bushman, whenever,

the spot for a considerable time with the ball of the thumb, strongly at first, and then gradually less forcibly, *homœopathically*, but not by an equally hard blow with an equally hard body, which would increase the evil *isopathically*!!”—*Organon*, p. 102.

remedies produce a series of symptoms exactly similar to (not to say “stronger” or “greater” than) those of the natural disease, “then their effects are permanent, and not to be distinguished from the main characters of natural maladies. Let arsenic produce “violent burning pain in the stomach, excessive thirst, constant vomiting, etc.,” and we may be certain that the inflammation which it has excited is not of an evanescent character, to be easily overcome by the vital force. We may be certain that, if superadded to, or substituted for, a *spontaneous* inflammation of the stomach, the patient would have little cause to congratulate himself on the change.”¹

Alleged Super-sensibility of Diseased Parts to even Infinitesimal Doses of Drugs.

There is another tenet bearing some relation to the two last, that demands a few remarks, more particularly as it is a point in the creed of homœopathy which is often and assiduously urged by the disciples of Hahnemann. Most inquisitive minds naturally ask, when looking first at the subject of homœopathy, How is it possible that its infinitesimal billionth and decillionth doses (seeing they are so extremely minute) can possibly have any action at all, and particularly an action of “exaltation and aggravation,” even though it were allowed that the drugs, nominally said to be contained in these billionths and decillionths, were capable, in the healthy individual, of exciting in “allopathic doses” symptoms of the disease against which they were exhibited? To explain this difficulty, Hahnemann urged two points:—First, that in producing symptoms similar to the disease, the drug given must act upon the exact parts in the organisation of the body that are really affected by the disease. In this reasoning, however, there was one strong oversight, viz., that if the drug given produced only similar, and not identical symptoms, it did not by any means of necessity follow, that it acted on the *same* part, and in the *same* way as the disease, for then its action would be isopathic rather than homœopathic; while the production of only *similar* symptoms, by its affecting the nearest points, would be like the “allopathic” action of a counter-irritant, rather than a homœopathic effect. And secondly, Hahnemann and his disciples further attempt to explain, that a

¹ Homœopathy, p. 101.

simple infinitesimal dose is only required, because the sensibility of the organ or part diseased is so exalted and increased by its morbid state, that it is susceptible to the slightest morbid curative influences; as the eye when inflamed is susceptible of a very small amount of light.

Further, Hahnemann and his disciples have argued, as we have seen in a preceding extract, that it was owing to this intensified sensibility in the diseased parts that a homœopathic drug, though possessing many different actions, still produced its medicinal homœopathic action only in each special case of disease by acting only on those parts that were exalted in sensibility by the disease; while, for the same reason, the dose was too minute to show any action upon those other organs and functions whose sensibility was not in the same way morbidly excited. As I have already remarked, this kind of specious sophistry has been much urged as a possible explanation of the curative agency of the infinitesimal homœopathic doses.

The utter fallacy of the argument, however, may easily be shown. I shall content myself with pointing it out by one or two examples.

Homœopathists aver, that an infinitesimal dose, properly chosen, acts directly upon the diseased part of the organization, because the sensibility of that part is, for the time being, intensified by the disease. If its sensibility, however, is increased (as this explanation takes for granted), so greatly as to be influenced and excited, and the special symptoms aggravated, by the smallest infinitesimal dose, then an allopathic dose of the SAME drug in the same disease, millions or decillions of times larger, and possessing the same medicinal power in an infinitely greater degree, must of necessity be attended with extreme danger, or at least with extreme "exaltative increase" of the symptoms. But innumerable instances prove, in every-day practice, that this is not the fact; that the very reverse is the fact; and that the very same medicines which are used by the homœopathists in "infinitesimal" doses, because of the supposed supersensibility of the affected parts, are constantly employed by the legitimate physician in ordinary, and hence enormously more powerful, doses in the very same disease, without any aggravation of the disease or its symptoms. A case or two in illustration may simplify the remark.

Colchicum is one of the remedies used both by the legitimate physician and by the homœopathist in some cases and modifications of gout. In his "Manual of Homœopathic Medicine," Jahr

enumerates "rheumatic and gouty affections," as the first diseases in which the employment of this drug is indicated; and he states the dilutions or potencies of the drug, which are most commonly used by the homœopathic practitioner, to be the 6th, 13th, and 30th. Let us suppose the homœopathic patient to have exhibited to him the lowest of these, viz., the 6th. A dose of this dilution or potency, contains 1,000,000,000,000th of a grain of colchicum. This infinitesimal dose acts upon the parts diseased in gout (argue the homœopathists), *because* these parts are rendered greatly supersensitive by the presence of the disease, and hence are capable of being influenced by a dose even so small as this. Further, according to Hahnemann and his disciples, even this small dose, before it produces a curative effect, should, from its homœopathic similarity, produce, in the first instance, an aggravation or exaltation of the symptoms. (See p. 210.) If, however, 4,000,000,000 or 5,000,000,000 times the amount of this dose were administered in a paroxysm of the same disease, the aggravation, instead of being merely perceptible, ought to be tremendous. Such, however, as is well known, is not the fact. For the use of four or five grains of the powder of colchicum, or of an equal dose of the tincture or wine of it, "possesses (observes Dr Garrod) almost a magical effect in relieving gout." "The relief obtained," says Dr Christison, "in most instances, is so prompt and effectual, that a patient who has once experienced it, will not easily be deterred from seeking it again."¹ Usually, when the medicine is given in such ordinary doses as I have named—doses 5,000,000,000 larger than those used by the homœopathist—it produces no aggravation whatever of the existing symptoms, or other particular phenomena. "Sometimes," observes Dr Watson of London, "the rapid disappearance of the gouty inflammation is its *only* perceptible effect. The patient may be in helpless agony, with a tumefied red joint to-day, walking about quite well, to-morrow."² Yet, according to the logic of the homœopathists, this dreadful dose should, *because* the diseased parts are so supersensitive, have produced a very fearful, or indeed fatal, aggravation of the malady.

Or let us take another example, and one often adverted to by homœopaths themselves. One of the remedies which homœopathists vaunt of as specifically useful in spasmodic asthma upon the

¹ Dispensatory, p. 354.

² Lectures on the Principles and Practice of Physic, vol. ii. p. 646.

homœopathic principle,¹ is an infinitesimal dose of ipecacuanha. The parts or structures in the organization, whose morbid state leads to a fit of spasmodic asthma—whatever these parts or structures may be—have their sensibility (argue the homœopathists), so much increased and exalted during the attack, that an infinitesimal dose of ipecacuanha, when given during it, immediately reaches these diseased super-excitables parts, and immediately acts upon them, producing, 1st, by its homœopathic similarity, and, 2d, by its *stronger* or *superior* medicinal potency over the natural disease, first, the “aggravation” (see p. 209), and, subsequently, the extinction of the asthmatic attack. If, however, a millionth, or a billionth, or decillionth of a grain of ipecacuanha does this,—and, by so doing, produces a salutary and curative result in the diseased and super-sensitive parts of the organization, that are the seat of asthma,—a common allopathic dose of the same drug in the same disease, and under the same circumstances (such as five, or ten, or twenty grains of ipecacuanha), ought, according to the same principle, to have such an enormous and dangerous effect upon the exalted sensibility of these super-excitables diseased parts, that imminent peril ought undoubtedly to ensue to the patient from taking the drug; and if the disease do not prove fatal under such a dose, it ought, at all events, to be vastly increased in severity by it. Unfortunately, however, for this part of Hahnemann’s theory, the very opposite is the truth. Hahnemann himself (p. 69) quotes Dr Akenside as his first authority in relation to the fact, that ipecacuanha can sometimes remove a fit of spasmodic asthma. Dr Akenside, in the account to

¹ For homœopaths untenably assert, that *because* the vapour of the powder of ipecacuanha produces asthmatic symptoms in a few rare idiosyncracies, as in one person out of 100,000, this circumstance explains, forsooth, why it is an occasional remedy for the asthmatic paroxysm in the remaining 99,999 persons. (Organon, p. 69.) It should at least cure the disease in those few individuals only in whom it had a tendency to cause it. But in all this supposed explanation, homœopathists forget two important items,—viz., that it is the powder (*not* the tincture) of ipecacuanha which causes the asthmatic symptoms in those few having this idiosyncrasy; but to cure or relieve asthma, they and others usually employ the non-producing preparations (the tincture or wine), and not the producing one (the powder); and 2d, that the occasional beneficial action of ipecacuanha in an asthmatic fit is not a homœopathic action, is shown by *other* emetics and nauseants besides ipecacuanha,—as tartrate of antimony, etc. (which have no power whatever to *cause* asthma), having the same power, however, of *curing* or relieving a fit of it when they are used during the fit, so as to exert an emetic or nauseant, and hence antispasmodic effect, like that exerted by the preparations of ipecacuanha.

which Hahnemann refers, states that, in “violent fits” of spasmodic asthma, he has found that twenty grains of ipecacuanha “failed not to procure great and *immediate relief*.” And in prescribing it for “chronical or habitual” asthma, he had seen the same medicine (ipecacuanha), in three or five grain doses, equally useful from its mere nauseant properties,—“so that (he adds) the relief which it brings to the asthma does not depend on the action of vomiting; but seems owing to that general antispasmodic or relaxing property, which, as I have elsewhere endeavoured to show, belongs to ipecacuanha, and of which its emetic operation itself appears, with great probability, to be a particular consequence.”¹

The case, then, amounts to this:—Suppose Hahnemann’s select dose, the decillionth, or 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000th of a grain of ipecacuanha to be sufficient, first, to aggravate, and then to extinguish, a spasmodic fit of asthma,—*because* the diseased parts of the organization producing the paroxysm were so supersensitive as to be affected at once by this infinitesimal dose,—then, the common allopathic dose of five, ten, or twenty grains ought to aggravate the fit to a dangerous, if not to a fatal, extent, acting as it does upon the very same supersensitive parts of the organization. But, on the other hand, as we have seen from Hahnemann’s own authority (Akenside), such doses, instead of aggravating and increasing, often and *immediately* arrest the fit. The chances then, in short, are, as 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 to 1 in this instance (and the same argument may be applied to a hundred others), that the *parts* of the organization affected are not in the supersensitive state to homœopathic or other medicinal influence taken for granted by this part of the homœopathic theory; or if those parts are thus supersensitive, then there are 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 chances to 1 that the action of ipecacuanha in asthma,—whatever that mode of action may be,—is not, at all events, a homœopathic action.

¹ London Medical Transactions, vol. i. p. 97.

Idiosyncracies ; and what they are supposed to indicate to the Homœopathist for his Therapeutics.

Aware of the inconsistency of this last doctrine, Hahnemann, in his "Organon," endeavours to put aside the force of the argument derived from it, by laying down, as is customary with him, an additional tenet to meet the difficulty. For this purpose he maintains, that if a substance or drug produce peculiar effects or symptoms only in rare exceptional instances, or idiosyncracies, still the same substance or drug has "the power of making the *same* impressions on *all* human bodies," when exhibited for the treatment of an appropriate disease. In other words, the inability of the drug or substance to make an impression upon every one, is only apparent ; and it does produce its idiosyncratic action upon every one in a state of disease calling for its use, and even upon healthy people if they only knew it. That substances or drugs that produce peculiar effects, and peculiar idiosyncracies, do, observes Hahnemann, "*actually* make this IMPRESSION ON EVERY HEALTHY BODY, is shown by this, that they render effectual homœopathic service as remedial agents to *all* sick persons, for morbid symptoms similar to those they are capable of producing, though apparently only in so-called idiosyncratic individuals."¹ "Thus," he adds, "the Princess Maria Porphyrogenita cured her brother the Emperor Alexius, who suffered from faintings, by sprinkling him with rose-water (τὸ τῶν ῥόδων στάλαγμα) in the presence of his aunt Eudoxia ; and Horstius saw much utility from rose-vinegar in cases of syncope."²

But surely no reasoning can be deemed necessary in answer to such silly and childish sophistry as the above. Because the savour of a rose makes some persons faint, it hence has the power of making this impression on every healthy individual ; and of curing, also, this same state of fainting in others. It should only at most *cure* the faintness in those few persons in whom it *causes* the fainting ; or otherwise the reasoning will lead to the most manifest absurdities. The savour of a cat in some idiosyncracies has, as is well known, the power of producing sudden fainting.³ On Hahnemann's prin-

¹ Organon, p. 212.

² Ibid, p. 212.

³ See instances of it, adduced by Prochaska, Marc, and others. Two of the strongest and most robust men in Scotland have this curious idiosyncrasy ; and in consequence they have been made the subjects of many painful but confirmatory

ciple, this animal, so generally domesticated with mankind, has consequently an unknown tendency to produce fainting in all mankind; and secondly, the approach of a cat to fainting persons, ought hence, also, to have the general effect of curing them of their syncope. Tycho Brahe trembled at the sight of a hare; and M. Marc¹ mentions two individuals in whom fainting was always produced by the odour of that animal. Hence it ought to be a fact, but is not a fact, that the odour of a hare should, like an inhalation of ammonia or rose water, recover mankind or womankind in general from fainting, and should make such an *impression* on every healthy human being, though unknowingly to him or her. Petroz states, that he knew a man incapable of fear, and who, in despite of all means of prevention, fainted always when he saw a boiled calf's head.² Would the sight of this dish prevent or recover other persons from attacks of syncope? And has a boiled calf's head a tendency to produce a syncopal "*impression*" on all mankind? The celebrated Haller was always made ill by the smell of cheese; and Boerhaave mentions a case of idiosyncrasy, in which the odour of the same substance led to bleeding from the nose. But I do not know that any even of the strictest followers of Hahnemann would expect to stop a bleeding from the nose by the smell of cheese. Among various idiosyncracies in the sense of hearing, Marc mentions an instance recorded by Bayle, of a woman fainting every time that she heard the stroke of a clock. Does the stroke of a clock cure fainting? Does it "actually" make this same *impression* of fainting on "every healthy body"? A case of idiosyncrasy is recorded in a young man who was always attacked with a feeling of suffocation and anxiety when he heard the sound of a brush. This brush-sound, then, should, according to Hahnemann's tenet, *cure* the same asthmatic symptoms in others who have nothing of the idiosyncrasy in question. The sound of water escaping from a pipe was sufficient to throw Bayle into convulsions. Would Hahnemann hence suppose that the sound of water from a pipe should relieve from convulsions other individuals in the family of man when they are attacked by them? Bachner and Tissot record epilepsy as

experiments by sceptical friends. These two gentlemen are cousins—a fact, among others, showing such idiosyncracies to run sometimes in families. Two brothers of one of them have the same antipathy; but in a less marked degree. Henry II. of France suffered from this idiosyncrasy against cats.

¹ Dictionaire des Sciences Medicales, vol. xxiii. p. 500.

² Ibid, vol. ii. p. 202.

produced in a person every time that he saw anything red. Would the sight of anything red cure epilepsy? And do or do not red colours produce an epileptic "*impression*" on "every healthy body"? Scaliger could be thrown into convulsions by the sight of cresses. Hence the sight of cresses ought, but certainly does not, cure convulsions in others. Haller and Prochaska have stated cases of idiosyncrasy, in which the mere *touch* of the skin of a peach with the hand produced a tendency to vomiting; and Wagner relates another instance, in which the contact with the finger of the same fruit always created a feeling of cold along the back. But though the touching of the skin of a peach *caused* a desire to vomit, and a feeling of chilliness in the back in these individuals, the touching of the same fruit will not *cure* a desire to vomit, or a feeling of chilliness along the back in all or in any other human individuals. For these causes produce no influence whatever on the human race at large, with the exception of the few individuals who have the special idiosyncrasy in question. When speaking of idiosyncracies, Prochaska justly remarks, that, "some men desire just what others are averse to." Hahnemann might as rationally, or rather irrationally, argue, that the desire of one thing by one man is the *cause* of other men being averse to that same thing, as that the *cause* of rose water curing fainting in the Emperor Alexius was from its producing fainting in some idiosyncracies. Crassus could not endure bread, nor Carden eggs,¹ as food. But because bread and eggs disagreed with their idiosyncracies, is that the cause or explanation of bread and eggs being both liked and found excellent articles of food and nutrition by other men? One of the gentlemen alluded to in the foot note, p. 220, always becomes sick and faint at the sight of roast-beef, and is obliged to leave the dinner table if this dish happens to be brought in.² According to Hahnemann's mode of reasoning, this idiosyncrasy would explain, forsooth, at once why roast-beef dispels and cures the sickness and faintness of hunger in Englishmen, and other human beings, who eat it at the dinner table; and that, too, although roast-beef (according at least to Hahne-

¹ A medical practitioner in Edinburgh has always been attacked with severe spasms in the abdomen whenever he partook of white of eggs, or of anything dressed with or containing eggs. He tells me that a relative of his own, on the mother's side, has the same curious idiosyncrasy.

² I have been informed of another gentleman upon whom the production of *roast-mutton* at dinner always produced the same strange effect.

mann's doctrine, p. 220) "actually makes this *impression*" (of sickness and faintness) on every healthy company before whom it is placed. Dr Prout¹ mentions the case of an individual who had this idiosyncrasy—that he could not eat mutton under any form without suffering from it vomiting, diarrhœa, and the symptoms of a violent and dangerous poison. If some writers on dietetics were to rise up and allege, that the fact of mutton producing such symptoms in this, and in a few other rare instances among mankind, was the *cause* and explanation of mutton being an agreeable and wholesome article of diet to all the other members of the human race—would not such an explanation be deemed as grievously outraging all logic and all common sense? Yet it is identically the absurd logic of *causation* propounded by Hahnemann as explanatory of the actions of his medicines in the instances alluded to. And if it be ridiculous in regard to the action of articles of diet, it is equally ridiculous in regard to the action of drugs.

When speaking of the follies and tendencies of the doctrines of homœopathy, Dr Cowan, of Reading, some time ago correctly observed in reference to it: "It is not the practice of medicine only that is at stake—it is the practice of *sound thinking*. When we supplant by mushroom theories truths which have hitherto occupied the minds of men, and been tested and confirmed by the experience of ages—when we bring into existence new phantasies of the human mind, and give them the outward formality of facts, we surrender the stability of our judgment, and depart from all soundness of thinking. With us, as medical practitioners, the rejection of homœopathy is a question of principle, not of doses—a question of morals, and not of etiquette."² And with Arnaud we can only wonder that, as shown by the past histories of innumerable other delusions, "such extravagant reasonings as these *have* found persons to propagate them, and others who *allow* themselves to be persuaded by them."

¹ On Stomach and Urinary Diseases, p. xxx.

² Speeches on Irregular Practice, p. 24.

CHAPTER XX.

INFINITESIMAL GLOBULES AS ARTICLES OF DIET; DOCTRINES OF THEIR REPETITION; OF THE SIMILARITY OF THE SAME DRUGS TO DIFFERENT DISSIMILAR DISEASES; ARGUMENT FOR INFINITESIMAL DOSES FROM VACCINATION, MINERAL WATERS, ETC.

ANY man who was not a dyspeptic, might swallow with perfect impunity many millions daily of the homœopathic globules medicated with any drug or poison whatever in the middle or higher potencies of homœopathic practitioners. Alone, the globules made with sugar of milk, or common sugar, would not suffice for the full maintenance and nourishment of the body. For physiological experiments have long shown that *sugar* alone is not sufficient by itself, as diet, to continue life. But the addition of starch, or of nitrogenised food to the sugar, would render it suitable and nutritious. Hence, if the globules were made, as they are now sometimes recommended to be made, of sugar of milk and starch (equal parts), a man might not only swallow millions of them daily, but might live upon them entirely as his daily food with perfect impunity. For though each globule were impregnated with decillionths, quintillionths, trillionths, billionths of aconite, nux vomica, or any other of the most potent drugs or poisons in the pharmacopœia, the quantity of poison in the globules would be so infinitely small that it would not affect the quality of the sugar and starch in the globules as salutary and nutritious dietetic articles. Indeed, every mouthful of ordinary food and drink which we take at table contains some of the homœopathic drugs, as calcarea, silix, etc. etc.etc., in much larger proportions than those in which they exist in the 6th, 12th, 24th, or 30th attenuations and globules in any homœopathic drug shop. It is no feat whatever, therefore, to swallow all the contents of all the bottles of a true homœopathic box. We have heard

of mothers being alarmed at their children eating up the contents of one or two of the homœopathic phials. The contents of any one, or of all the phials commixed, would make, with milk, a very good dietetic pap, on which most children might be daily fed, and solely brought up with the greatest safety, and the best result. If the surplus of sugar above the amount of starch did not produce indigestion (which it might do in some stomachs), the starch and sugar globules of the homœopath, if duly “medicated” and “potentised,” with decillionths, quintillionths, or trillionths of their strongest and most powerful drugs, would be, with water or milk, a kind of diet on which men or cattle might thrive and fatten, provided only they were supplied with an amount of them at each meal sufficiently full and ample. The *quality* of these medicated and potentised globules would be dietetically nutritious and safe enough as food, provided only the *quantity* of them supplied were large enough.¹

In different parts of the present essay, I have described the exiguity of the amount of medicine in relation to the amount of sugar and starch in globules of different potencies or attenuations; so that, at present, it is unnecessary to recur at length to that topic. We have also already seen that Hahnemann recommended and employed globules of the 30th dilution or attenuation as “the best dose” in all diseases—acute and chronic. Another question or tenet is—How often should such infinitesimal globules be given to the patient, in order to derive from them their supposed curative influence?

In the first edition of his “Organon,” Hahnemann (observes Dr Curie) “recommended his pupils to let the action of one dose of a homœopathic remedy be *completely exhausted* before giving another remedy, or a second dose of the first. He, indeed, *proscribed* repetition; observing that one large dose, or several smaller ones, given at short intervals, did NOT allow the vital power to re-act in a proper degree.”² Latterly, Hahnemann greatly modified and altered this tenet.

¹ Of course, in these remarks I take it for granted that the globules are truly homœopathic, and not surreptitiously and dishonestly drugged, as they sometimes are, with allopathic doses of strong medicines, as already described at pp. 33 and 188. Let me here observe, that in the former page (footnote, p. 33), the quantity of morphia detected by Dr Taylor in a homœopathic powder exhibited by Dr C —, is accidentally mis-stated. It was not “one-third of a grain,” but one whole grain.—See Dr Taylor’s own statement, copied in p. 189.

² Practice of Homœopathy, p. 76.

"In the former editions of the 'Organon,' I have advised," says Hahnemann, "that a single dose of a well-selected homœopathic medicine should always be allowed, first fully to expend its action, before a new medicine is given, or the same one repeated—a doctrine which was the result of the positive experience, that neither by a larger dose of the remedy which may have been well chosen (as has been again recently proposed, but which would be, as it were, a retrograde movement), nor, what amounts to the same thing, by several small doses of it, given in quick succession, can the greatest possible good be effected in the cure of diseases, more especially of chronic ones, and the reason of this is, that by such a procedure the vital force does not quickly accommodate itself to the change from its derangement by the natural disease into the similar medicinal disease, but is usually so violently excited and convulsed by a larger dose, or also by smaller doses of even a homœopathically chosen remedy, given rapidly one after the other, that in most cases its re-action will be ANYTHING BUT SALUTARY, and will do MORE HARM than good."—*Organon*, p. 288.

In laying down the rules for the repetition of the dose in the last edition of the "*Organon*," he states that "the smallest doses of the best-selected homœopathic medicines *may* be repeated with the best, often with incredible results, at intervals of 14, 12, 10, 8, 7 days; and where rapidity is requisite in chronic diseases, resembling cases of acute disease, at still shorter intervals; but in acute diseases at very much shorter periods, every 24, 12, 8, 4 hours, in the very acutest every hour, up to as often as every five minutes—in every case in proportion to the more or less rapid course of the disease or action of the medicine employed."¹

The rules thus laid down by Hahnemann in regard to the repetition of the infinitesimal doses, were scarcely followed by him in his own practice, in which he apparently continued to adhere more nearly to his first tenets on the subject. In his translation of the fifth edition of the "*Organon*," Dr Dudgeon quotes a letter of Dr Crosiero, giving, from personal observation, an account of the doses, and repetition of them, used by Hahnemann in his own practice, up to the period of his decease, or during the years following the appearance of the last edition of the "*Organon*." In employing, as he generally did, globules impregnated with the 30th dilution, and allowing them to be smelled only, not swallowed by his patients, Hahnemann, "in chronic diseases, happen what might, NEVER (says Dr Crosiero) allowed this olfaction to be repeated oftener than *once a-week*."² "If we do not (he held at one time) allow the suitably selected antipsoric remedy to act out its full time, the whole treatment becomes *null*."³ And in acute

¹ *Organon*, p. 291.

² See *Organon*, p. 303 and pp. 291 and 293.

³ *Chronic Diseases*, 1st edition.

cases, after dissolving one globule of the 30th dilution in a large quantity of fluid, "it was rare for him to give more than one spoonful ONCE in the twenty-four hours;" and Hahnemann himself tells us, that he "generally witnessed aggravations from the suitable remedy which he had given one day, when repeated the next day, and the next.¹ Hahnemann further solemnly states, with the greatest gravity, that he had found from experience, when, instead of one single dose or globule, he administered six, seven, or eight globules, or even a half or a whole drop of a homœopathic medicine in the "highest dynamisation" (30th dilution), "the result was almost always less favourable than it should have been; it was often *actually unfavourable*; often even *very bad*; an injury that in a patient so treated it is difficult to repair."²

In other words, this "actually unfavourable" or "very bad" result and injury was, Hahnemann alleges, liable to follow, if, instead of exhibiting one globule, he exhibited six, seven, or eight globules,³ drugged by being moistened in a drop out of an unlimited ocean of spirit containing a single grain of the drug, this medicated ocean itself, containing a single grain, being so large that it had a radius far greater in depth than from the Earth to Sirius. (See Appendix.)

Most other men, except this "sublime thinker" and his disciples, would certainly have fancied that it mattered very little whether a patient swallowed one or swallowed eight globules dipped in such an infinite sea of spirit, medicated by a single grain of a drug; and that the unfavourable or bad results alleged to be seen by him were not the effect of the dose, is flagrantly shown by many of his own followers daily and hourly using, and repeating too, doses of the same drugs, millions and millions and millions of times larger and greater, without any such alleged effects following.

Further, Hahnemann, as we have previously seen, avers, that "in no case is it requisite to administer more than one single medicinal substance at one time."⁴ And he declaims against those of his followers who venture to give (as many in England seem to do) two

¹ Organon, p. 290. One drop was reckoned by Hahnemann adequate to moisten and medicate duly about 300 globules (p. 329).

² Ibid, p. 290.

³ Dr Wahl "at first used to swear by Hahnemann," but now "he does not think, it requisite to count the globules anxiously, and alleges that even drops won't kill." This is stated, and with perfect seriousness, in *Journal of Homœopathy* 1849, p. 459.

⁴ Organon, p. 319.

or more different medicines to the same patient at or near the same period,—stirring up two or more new medicinal diseases. “Some homœopathists,” he says, “have made the experiment in cases where they deemed one remedy suitable for one portion of the symptoms of a case of disease, and a second for another portion, of administering both remedies at once, or almost at once; but I earnestly deprecate such *hazardous experiments*, that can never be necessary, though they may sometimes seem to be of use.”¹ In fact, as the effects of most of the more important homœopathic drugs are averred by Hahnemann, Jahr, etc., not to cease till the end of twenty, forty, or more days, the exhibition of two or more different medicines to the same patient, on the same day, or, as some practitioners use them, within a few hours, must be *hazardous*,—provided always there was any truth in homœopathy, and in Hahnemann’s idea that the commixture of two or more medicines is always wrong, inasmuch as this kind of practice virtually amounts to a commixture.²

But all “hazard” is removed by the fact, that whether the infinitesimal dose is repeated or is not repeated,—whether it is one globule or eight globules,—a fraction of a decillion drop or a whole drop,—whether it is merely a decillionth of a grain, or whether it is million-folds more, as a billionth—the results are constantly one and the same,—the infinitesimal dose or doses being of no medicinal effect whatever, whether for good or for evil, and the disease or diseases under their imaginary use showing always the same progress and phenomena, because always merely pursuing their own natural courses, unaffected altogether by medicinal treatment.

The same homœopathic drugs, acting on the principle of similarity, are yet capable of curing a number of diseases that are quite dissimilar from each other.

Many of the remedies used in medicine produce different effects upon the same individuals when given in different doses. Thus,

¹ Organon, p. 319.

² Dr Grosse, whose usual dilutions are, Jeniechens, 200th, 400th, 800th, and 900th, “often contents himself,” observes Dr Balfour, “with allowing the patient to smell the remedy (whether one or more globules at one time I am not aware), waiting patiently for four weeks or so for the completion of the cure, not even permitting a ‘second smell’ in the interim.”—*British and Foreign Review*, vol. xxii. p. 568. Dr Grosse says he cured his own horse of staggers by allowing him thus to smell of the 200th dilution of Coeculus!—*Archives für Hom. Heilkunst*, vol. xxi. p. 35.

according to the dose exhibited, antimony, ipecacuanha, etc., may be made to act as an emetic, or as a nauseant merely, or as a diaphoretic. Turpentine, supertartrate of potass, etc., may, according to the doses exhibited, be made to act as purgatives or as diuretics. Opium may be given so as to act either as a stimulant or as a narcotic; and so on. Homœopaths, however, believe that any medicine, given in an infinitesimal dose, produces its appropriate curative effect independently of quantity, and independently of the fact of its acting differently on the same healthy individual in different quantities. "It is not, however," observes Dr Bushnan, "the name of the substance that produces certain specific effects, nor even the substance itself, but the substance joined to quantity; unless, indeed, we be prepared to admit the monstrous absurdity that substances produce the same effects independently of the quantities in which they are administered. To illustrate this argument in a familiar manner, let us suppose that we have a natural disease, the symptoms of which are represented by *a*; and a medicine, the effects of which, at different doses, are represented by *a*, *b*, *c*; it is clear that the remedy given in the dose *a*, which produces symptoms similar to those of the disease *a*, is the only one that can be called homœopathic; and that it ceases to be homœopathic, though retaining its original name, whenever it produces the effects represented by *b* or *c*."¹ We have already, in a preceding page (p. 69), given a sufficient illustration of this illogical homœopathic reasoning, taking opium as our example. To that we would again refer, without unnecessarily loading our pages with new examples here.

But there is a different correlative subject or tenet regarding which it is necessary to say a few words. Hahnemann and his followers practise homœopathy as if they believed that the same dose of the same medicine could possibly be quite similar to, and consequently quite curative of, various affections most dissimilar and unlike to each other. We have already seen, that Hahnemann lays it down as a leading and dominant proposition in homœopathy, that the artificial symptoms produced by any remedy which is given should not only be "similar," but "very similar"—"the most similar possible"—to the symptoms of the natural pre-existing disease, for the cure and removal of which the remedy was exhibited. (See antecedently, p. 163.) Yet he and his disciples constantly tell us, that the same

¹ Homœopathy and the Homœopaths, p. 132.

infinitesimal dose of the same remedy will homœopathically cure two, ten, or twenty diseases which, in relation to each other, are in no way "similar," or "very similar," or "as similar as possible,"—but the very opposite and the very reverse of all this.

Let us illustrate this remark by an example or two. Any of the more important homœopathic drugs might serve as an illustration.

Among the cases of disease in which *Belladonna*, for example, is "most frequently indicated," Jahr mentions amongst others the following:—"epilepsy" and "puerperal peritonitis;"—"diarrhœa" and "cancerous affections;"—"difficult dentition" and "carbuncles;"—"St Vitus's dance" and "stings of insects;"—"jaundice" and "measles;"—"eruption of pimples on the face" and "typhoid fevers;"—"adhesion of the placenta" and "hooping-cough;"—"pneumonia" and "spontaneous dislocations in infants;"—"hemorrhoids" and "milk fever;"—"influenza" and "rickety affections;"—"stuttering" and "scrofulous ulcers;"—"toothache" and "scirrhous induration of the lips;"—"hydrophobia" and the "ophthalmia of new-born infants," etc. etc. But if a dose of belladonna, by its power of producing symptoms "as similar as possible" to epilepsy or some varieties of that disease, is capable of curing epilepsy, the same drug cannot surely homœopathically cure, by producing also in other patients symptoms "as similar as possible" to puerperal peritonitis, to diarrhœa and cancerous affections, jaundice, and measles, etc., etc., as these and the other diseases named are as *dissimilar* as possible to the symptoms of epilepsy, and to the symptoms of each other. If it is similar in its medicinal action and effects to one of these diseases, it cannot be "as similar as possible" in its medicinal action and effects to the symptoms of the other remaining affections.¹

¹ In his enumeration of the various medicinal virtues and properties of belladonna, Jahr does not describe it as a prophylactic against scarlet fever—a property confidently ascribed to it by Hahnemann and other homœopaths. "By taking (says Hahnemann) the smallest possible dose of belladonna, we are protected from scarlet fever." (*Organon*, p. 84.) Let me add, that while I believe medicine will yet most probably discover prophylactic measures against scarlet fever, measles, etc., belladonna has most certainly no claim whatever to be considered a preventative against scarlatina. We possess no positive evidence in reference to its protective influence; and we know it has entirely failed when tried under the most favourable circumstances. Thus, in George Watson's Hospital, Edinburgh, containing fifty-four boys susceptible of scarlatina, twenty-five boys took scarlet fever in the earlier part of 1850; a large proportion to be attacked in a single epidemic in such an hospital. Yet twenty-three out of these twenty-five had, for a month, pre-

Or let us take as another example, Chalk or *Carbonate of Lime*, or *Calcareo carbonica*, as the homœopathists term it.

In his work on homœopathic medicine, Jahr states "the principal affections which call for the employment of this medicine." Among these affections are the following:—"Obstinate constipation" and "caries and other affections of the bones;"—"difficulty in learning to walk" and "nasal polypus;"—"chlorosis" and "urinary calculus;"—"intermittent fevers" and "gouty nodosities;"—"diarrhœa" and "sterility;"—"drunkenness" and "taenia;"—"milk crust" and "goître;"—"melancholy" and "fistula lachrymalis;"—"hysterical spasms" and "consumption;"—"warts" and "ague," etc., etc. Now, the symptoms produced in a healthy person by the homœopathic drug should, we repeat, be "similar," "very similar," "as similar as possible," to the symptoms of the disease which it is to cure. But if the symptoms produced in a healthy individual by the use of carbonate of lime be "very similar" to "obstinate constipation," how can they be also "very similar" to the symptoms of "caries of the bones;" if "very similar" to the symptoms of stone in the bladder or goître, how can they also be "very similar" to those of drunkenness and diarrhœa, of melancholy and warts; and so forth? It is simply ridiculous and impossible for a remedy to have symptoms "*very similar*" to one of these diseases, and symptoms also "*very similar*" to some ten or twenty other diseases; which diseases have themselves no similarity whatever in their symptoms or

viously to their attack, been placed on belladonna night and morning as a possible prophylactic; and two out of these twenty-three died. (See Mr Bell's excellent paper in "Monthly Journal of Medical Science," for August 1851.) In Heriot's Hospital, my friend, Dr Andrew Wood, in the last epidemic of scarlet fever, placed half of the boys, in each ward or sleeping division, on belladonna, and left the other half without any such protection. The disease did not spread much; but at least as many of those using the belladonna, as of those not using it, were attacked; and the only fatal case out of forty which occurred during that epidemic was that of a boy who had been using belladonna in doses of one-eighth grain twice a-day for three weeks previously to his being attacked. Would not the medical world reject variolation or vaccination as a prophylactic against small-pox if as many of those submitted to it took variola, as usually occurred without any prophylactic, or if more were attacked with variola who were subjected, than of those who were not subjected, to the treatment? Most of the more rational homœopathic physicians have, I believe, given up the idea. "Just as often," observes one of them, Dr Elb of Dresden, "have I found that children have been attacked by it (scarlet fever), notwithstanding the use of belladonna for several weeks, and that this long previous use of the belladonna had not even the power of diminishing the violence of the disease."—*Journal of Homœopathy* for 1849, p. 35.

in their nature to the first, nor to each other. A single drug, or the effects of a drug, cannot be "very similar," or "as similar as possible" to several diseases, or the effects of several diseases, which are themselves totally and entirely dissimilar one from another.

Supposed Arguments for Possible Action of Infinitesimal doses from Mental Phenomena, Vaccination, Smells, Mineral Waters, etc.

"In the practice of homœopathy, the system of giving small doses is *included*;" so (in despite of what some have tried to aver to the contrary), Hahnemann's own ardent defenders declare;¹ and so Hahnemann himself always maintains. And in order to give some appearance of reason for the belief in the action of infinitesimal doses of material drugs—as the metals, vegetable products, etc.—Hahnemann adduced the great powers of "caloric" and "light," which, he says, are "infinitely *lighter* than the medicinal contents of the smallest doses used in homœopathy;" or, "let common-place physicians (he exclaims) *weigh*, if they can, the irritating words that bring on a bilious fever, or the mournful intelligence respecting her only son that kills the mother,"² etc.

Certainly a decillionth of mercury, or of oyster shell, or of sulphur, or of any homœopathic drug, is not "lighter" than caloric and light, for light and caloric are in their essence and nature "imponderable" bodies. But because such imponderable bodies—which in their natural state are "destitute of weight"—may be made "enormously powerful things," when evolved and present in sufficient quantity, this is no reason whatever, but the very reverse, for believing that bodies which, on the contrary, in *their* natural state, are material and ponderable, like mercury, or oyster shell, or sulphur, could yet possess the curative qualities of gold, or oyster shell, or sulphur, when used in infinitesimal dilutions, which were deprived of all appreciable material presence of them. Hahnemann's comparison is one between objects not logically admitting of such comparison. And still more outraging all logic and philosophy is his argument in favour of infinitesimal doses of *material* drugs being capable of producing effects upon the human economy, because, forsooth, *mental* in-

¹ Defence of Hahnemann and his Doctrines, p. 91. See also antecedently, chap. v. p. 38.

² Organon, p. 325.

fluences (which are also “destitute of weight”) produce most marked effects upon it. In order that any comparisons may be of any use, the things compared must admit of comparison. But things and thoughts—“matter” and “mind”—are two entities which cannot be thus compared, any more than in their individual details we could compare the phenomena of oyster shells with the phenomena of the association of ideas, the nature of mercury with the nature of memory, sulphur with sadness, pulsatilla with perceptions, etc. Nor, as far as I have observed, does a single one of Hahnemann’s British disciples fall into the strange and indefensible mistake committed by Hahnemann, of trying to derive an argument in favour of the possible action of infinitesimal doses of *material* drugs from the analogy of the actions of *imponderable* bodies and of *mental* influences.

But—passing from such untenable arguments and analogies—some disciples of homœopathy argue, that small doses of substances which are material, sometimes produced great effects upon the human body—as the introduction by *inoculation* of a minute quantity of *Small-pox* or *Cow-pox* matter. And there is no doubt of the truth in these instances, both of the smallness of the dose, and of the greatness of the result. But two considerations here come into account which destroy altogether any argument that can be derived from these instances in favour of the infinitesimal doses of homœopaths. For, *first*, the doses of small-pox or cow-pox matter which are necessary to cause by inoculation small-pox or cow-pox in susceptible individuals are *not* infinitesimal doses. A decillionth, or octillionth, or sextillionth, or quadrillionth, or billionth dilution, for example, of a drop of small-pox or cow-pox matter would not impart to these dilutions a power of giving small-pox or cow-pox. A drop, for instance, of small-pox or cow-pox matter reduced to the quintillionth dilution only,—or, in other words, dissolved duly in a sea, thousands of times greater than the whole oceans of the earth,—would not invest the waters of that sea with the power of producing small-pox or cow-pox by inoculation or otherwise; though the homœopaths aver that a single drop or grain of their drugs duly dissolved in such an enormous sea would invest *every* drop of this same amount of fluid with the special curative powers of the particular medicine dissolved. Indeed, a drop of small-pox or cow-pox matter dissolved down to the 2d dilution even of homœopaths, or to the 10,000th degree only, would, I believe, entirely fail in imparting these diseases by inoculation or any other means.

But *secondly*, there is a mighty difference between the mode of action of an appreciable inoculable dose of small-pox or cow-pox matter upon the body, and the possible effect of inappreciable infinitesimal doses of homœopathic drugs. The matters of small-pox and cow-pox so act upon the blood and tissues of the body, that when they take effect at all they always lead to the *reproduction* in the individuals affected with them, in an increased degree and amount, of new small-pox and new cow-pox matter—just as the matter of yeast leads to the reproduction of new yeast in fermenting bodies, and impregnated seeds and ova lead to the reproduction of new plants and animals. Infinitesimal doses of a homœopathic drug have no such power of multiplying themselves for effect in the blood or bodies of those who swallow them. A dose of antimony, for example, or mercury, or quinine, or morphia, whether allopathic or homœopathic in amount, does not lead to the production of a multiplied amount of antimony, mercury, quinine, or morphia in the system; or act by this multiplication. You cannot, either in the living or dead animal body, make antimony or mercury, etc., out of blood and tissues in which antimony and mercury do not exist. If it were otherwise, then homœopathy and infinitesimal doses might lay claim to the discovery of the true philosopher's stone. For we have seen Hahnemann using as an alleged infallible remedy against suicidal mania a quintillionth of gold; and if gold had, when exhibited, a power of multiplication within the human system, homœopathists should be able to extract it in indefinite quantities from the bodies (not the purses) of their patients. Every man would then be a true alchemical laboratory, inasmuch as he would be able to make and generate gold in his own system.

Another argument from the phenomena of *Smells* is sometimes adduced in support of the possible action of infinitesimal doses of drugs. It has been alleged, because a piece of musk will scent the air of an open room without any apparent diminution in the bulk of the musk, for months or years, that the portions of matter thrown off from the musk and producing this continuous odour must be infinitesimal in size. But this argument takes for granted exactly what some of our best mathematicians and natural philosophers are now inclined entirely to doubt, viz., that, in producing the sensation of smell, musk or other bodies throw off any material particles at all. The sensations of sound and of light are, as all authorities, I believe,

now admit, the results of undulations or vibrations transmitted to us from sonorous or luminous bodies; and not the results of anything *material* transmitted or thrown off from these bodies. The strings of the piano, or a piece of incandescent iron, do not, in order to produce the sensations of sound or light, send forth into our ears infinitesimal material doses of the piano strings, or send forth into our eyes infinitesimal material doses of the glowing iron. It is entirely against these analogies to suppose, that in order to produce the sensation of smelling, an infinitesimal dose of the smelling body requires to be thrown off from that body and brought in contact with our olfactory nerves. This question is (observes Dr Routh) sometimes asked, "How much scent remains behind after a hare, so that the dogs may detect it? Here is an example of an infinitesimal dose exerting a sensible effect. 1. I must answer (observes Dr Routh), How is it that in frosty weather the scent is destroyed, and the dogs lose it, and yet the hare passed equally over the ground? 2. How do we know that it is *not* owing to an undulating movement that smell is diffused? It is so for light, so for sound, so for touch. Must we necessarily *imbibe* an infinitesimal dose of light, sound, an opposing body, to see, hear, and feel? If we look at a bright light a few moments, the impression remains on the eye, though it be closed, and the light has disappeared. We hear a loud sound; it buzzes in the ears still, though the sound has ceased. If we travel on a railway or a steamer for some hours, at night we feel as if we were moving along still. So it is with smell. There is no more reason for believing that the dog has imbibed an infinitely small amount of the hare, to smell it, than that we should have imbibed part of a railway or steamer, because we seem after we have left it to be in it."¹

Lastly, I have sometimes heard the undoubted curative influence of *Mineral Waters* adduced as an argument in favour of the possible action of infinitesimal homœopathic doses—it being supposed the medicinal ingredients in these waters were almost infinitesimal in amount. The argument, however, is one full of strange fallacies; and the allowed curative effects of mineral waters tell altogether against, and not in favour of, homœopathy. For, 1st, the active medicinal ingredients in all the mineral waters hitherto known and investigated are not in infinitesimal doses, but, on the contrary,

¹ Routh's Fallacies of Homœopathy, p. 13.

always in quantities capable of being analysed, and tested, and weighed; and the waters themselves, with these contained ingredients, are not taken by patients in infinitesimal drops, or fractions of a drop, (which they should be, according to the homœopathic principle,) but they are swallowed in tumblers, or in doses of ounces or even pounds daily. And 2d, all these mineral waters contain several, most of them very *many*, medicinal saline ingredients; and consequently each dose swallowed by those who use and benefit by them, sets sadly at defiance that leading axiom of Hahnemann,¹ namely, “not to administer more than one single, *simple* medicinal substance at one time,” for, to repeat his own words, “a compound can never make a *simple* in all eternity, never;”² and yet these waters—which, I believe, the homœopaths, like other physicians, use as curative agents—are all compound, exactly like many of the prescriptions employed in ordinary legitimate medical practice.

“When we come (observes Dr Thomas Reid) to be instructed by philosophers, we must bring the light of *common sense* along with us, and by it judge of the new light.” In the above, as in other parts of its tenets (see p. 11), homœopathy breaks sadly and irreparably down under the application of this simple but searching confession of medical faith.

¹ Organon, p. 319.

² Lesser Writings, p. 834.

CHAPTER XXI.

LAW OF SIMILIA SIMILIBUS CURANTUR ; ITS UNIVERSALITY ; EVIDENCE AGAINST IT FROM QUININE, ETC. ; RECAPITULATION OF PRINCIPAL ARGUMENTS, (DYNAMIZATION, EXPERIENCE, ETC.,) IN FAVOUR OF HOMŒOPATHY, AND ANSWERS TO THEM ; TRUE CHARACTER OF HOMŒOPATHIC CURES.

IN medicine and surgery we have many *general facts* or *laws*, more or less correctly ascertained and established ; and the art of medicine consists in the practical application of these laws to the relief and cure of the diseases of our patients. These laws are, some of a higher, some of a lower, type of generality. As examples of them, we have, for instance, the law, that various contagious diseases, more particularly eruptive fevers, seldom attack the same individual twice during life ; and the practical application of this law, in artificial inoculation with small-pox and cow-pox, has already saved millions of human lives. As a general law, cinchona has the power of arresting and curing diseases of an intermittent or periodic type, as intermittent fever or ague, intermittent neuralgia, etc. As a general law, the employment of opium arrests and cures irritative diarrhœa ; iron cures chlorosis, etc. etc.

But the law laid down by Hahnemann, and which forms the ground-work of homœopathy,—viz. *similia similibus curantur*, is regarded by him and his disciples, not in the light of a *general* law, but as a UNIVERSAL and *infallible* law in therapeutics. This fundamental homœopathic law, as stated by him, amounts, as we have often already seen, to this—that to effect the cure of diseases, we should in every case give “a medicine which can itself produce an affection similar to that sought to be cured.” (*Organon*, p. 56). “The truth,” he avers, “is *only* to be found in this method.” “It is not possible,” he states, “to perform a cure but by the aid of a remedy which produces symptoms similar to those of the disease itself.” (P. 73.) He holds up this law of *similia similibus curantur*—“like is cured by like”—as “the *only* therapeutic law conformable

to nature," (p. 55);—"the *only* therapeutie law consonant to nature," (p. 100);—as an "infallible" (p. 73);—an "nuerring law," (p. 78);—as "*the* great *sole* therapeutic law," (p. 153);—as a "mode of cure founded on an eternal, infallible law of nature." (P. 156.)

"It is a law of treatment" (observes one of the most acute and learned English homœopathic writers, Dr Scott) "applicable to *all* forms of disease," "the UNIVERSAL law of cure."¹ "And when we speak" (observe other English homœopathists)² "of the UNIVERSALITY of the law of homœopathy, we employ the term UNIVERSAL, as it is used in speaking of any other general physical law; and as no harm has yet accrued to science from calling gravitation a *universal* law, although it is presumptuous in us to apply such a term to any general fact ascertained only by observation, so no harm will result to medicine from a similar application of the term in this instance, since every reflecting reader is aware of the implied limitation."

For one, I am most willing to admit that if Hahnemann, or any man, could discover a single, universal, infallible law in therapeutics, applicable to "all diseases and all cases of disease," it would constitute the greatest imaginable discovery in medicine. Many men have in the same way fancied that they have discovered a single infallible *universal* remedy for "all diseases and for all cases of disease." Priessnitz thought that his cold water was such; Morrison averred that his pills were such; and so on. "I find (wrote Lady Mary Wortley Montague in 1748) that tar-water has succeeded to Ward's drops;³ and it is possible some other form of quackery has by this time taken place of that. The English (she adds) are, more than any other nations, infatuated by the prospect of UNIVERSAL medicine."⁴ All such exclusive systems and ideas, however (though containing,

¹ See quotations anteedently, p. 146, and p. 195. And also "British Journal of Homœopathy" for July 1852, p. 366. "Never," Dr Scott observes, till Hahnemann's time was *similia similibus curantur* "asserted as a UNIVERSAL LAW."

² Defence of Hahnemann and his Doctrines, p. 65. For the supposed authors see anteedently foot note, p. 4.

³ For some notices of Dr Ward's drops or pills, and the other "infallible" but now forgotten quakeries of the last century, see Wadd's *Mems. and Maxims*. He describes various bonesetters, from the Earl of Derby (p. 130) down to Mrs Mapp, a female quack and bonesetter, who rode in a coach and six with outriders.

⁴ "There is always," observed the author of "Anti-Soris" (in 1744), "some one arch quackery that carries the bell in England. If it is not tar-water, it is something else." An anecdote told, in the last century, of Dr Mead, affords a sad though overstrained idea of the medical credulity of the people of England, and of their ap-

as most of them do, some germs of truth), have ended in failure; and principally because they have been improperly and indiscreetly held up as *universal* and infallible laws, applicable to the treatment of all diseases. Hahnemann deemed, as we have seen, the therapeutic law, "Like is cured by like," as a law universal in its character, and universal in its application; but most assuredly he adduced nothing approaching to adequate proof to substantiate his bold hypothesis. The imagined instances, for example, which he gives of it in the introduction to his *Organon*, are almost all of doubtful and imperfectly observed phenomena, and the analogies he draws are often most forced and irrelevant. Besides all of these alleged homœopathic cures which he there cites from "allopathic authors, are cures effected in utter defiance of his own laws regarding the practical working of homœopathy,—the patients being treated with medicinal mixtures and not single drugs—not with infinitesimal, but with large and hence dangerous doses of the various drugs in these mixtures—and all proof being entirely wanting that the medicinal symptoms of the principal drug or drugs corresponded, as they ought to do,¹ to the

titude to patronise anything mystic, and marvellous, and unintelligent to them in medicine—"A man of good education had become a quack, and had a booth in one of the most frequented streets of London. He calculated on the weakness and credulity of mankind, and made a most fortunate speculation. Mead, regretting that an intelligent man, capable of advancing truth, should degrade himself to such a trade, advised him to abandon it. 'How many men a day,' said the quack, 'do you think pass through this street?' 'Perhaps 20,000,' said the doctor. 'And how many of these do you suppose possess the right use of their senses, and a sound judgment?' 'Five hundred.' 'The proportion is too great,' said the quack. 'A hundred, then.' 'Still too much.' At last they agreed to reckon them at ten. 'Let me alone, then,' said the quack; 'let me levy on these 19,990 *fools* the tribute which they owe me, and I have no objection to the ten having in you that confidence which most assuredly you well deserve.'"—*Richerand's Erreurs Populaires Relatives à la Médecine*; and *Dr Glover's Philosophy of Medicine*, p. 4. Large sums are still squandered annually by the English public on advertised empiric drugs and nostrums. We believe ourselves to be considerably within bounds when we reckon at least half a million of pounds sterling, to be thus yearly sacrificed uselessly and hurtfully at the shrine of medical credulity and quackery by the people of Great Britain. In an account lately published of a living London medicine-vendor (one who has succeeded as such, after failing in his own business as a lawyer), it is stated that this empiric alone spends on his own account L.20,000 annually in advertising his drugs; and several others of the same class advertise even more widely than he does. In 1849, there were L.42,000 paid to the revenue of England for stamps merely to quack medicines.

¹ For the "true physician knows that he has to judge of and cure diseases not according to the similarity of the name of a single one of their symptoms, but according to the sum total of all the signs of the *individual* state of each particular patient."—*Organon*, p. 187.

existing diseased symptoms at the time of exhibition. They are utterly and totally inadequate to show, that the law is even a *general* one in therapeutics, not to say an "*eternal infallible*" law, or theory of cure, as he declared it to be. For a universal law in medicine, or in other sciences, is a law, of course, that admits of no true exception to its operation; and the individual facts and premises upon which it is primarily built, like the facts to which it subsequently extends, should all stand forth clearly and indubitably in unequivocal support of it.

In examining the homœopathic law, "*similia similibus curantur*," in some of the preceding chapters, we have seen how utterly it fails in showing any of these characteristics of an universal law, or even of a law of a low degree of generality. We have found, indeed, that when we take Hahnemann's own selected proofs of it in *visible* cutaneous diseases, that his own chosen instances of the operation of his law afford the most glaring evidence against, instead of in favour of such a law. In consequence of the action of this universal, infallible law, it "invariably" happens, according to Hahnemann, that small-pox (as a remedy) "*immediately removes entirely*" cow-pox (as a pre-existing disease) when the small-pox supervenes on a person having a cow-pock in progress upon him. We have seen (See Chapter XV.) that this consequence (which ought certainly to follow if the homœopathic law were a true law), does *not* follow under the circumstances stated; and that Hahnemann required to misrepresent and misquote the facts, in order to gain some appearance of proof of his law from this—the case which he himself chooses as one of the most evident instances in disease in favour of his law. We have found his other instances of the homœopathic influence of two diseases upon each other, open to the same objection. And in the very class of cases which he himself brings forward as the strongest evidence in favour of his law—the curative influence of visible cutaneous diseases upon each other—we have seen his law apparently succeed where, from all sufficient want of similarity between the curing and cured diseases, it ought to fail; and, on the contrary, we have seen it fail where, from the greatness and perfectness of similarity between two co-existing or consequent diseases, it ought undoubtedly to succeed.

Hahnemann and his followers have appealed, however, in favour

of their pretended universal law, to another variety of evidence than that dangerous kind derived from the observation of the mutual influence of visible cutaneous diseases upon each other. They aver, that we may trace incontrovertible proofs and evidence in favour of the law, "*similia similibus curantur*," if we study the effects upon healthy men of remedies that are known and acknowledged to cure special diseases; inasmuch as that we will find, that the remedies which *cure* particular diseases in the sick, *cause* in the economy the same or similar diseases when they are used by the healthy. Let us consider then, whether, as homœopathists allege, the remedies which we use for the *removal* of diseases from individuals affected with them, would and do lead to the *production* of the same or similar diseases, when taken by other individuals who are at the time unaffected with these ailments.

It would be a very wearisome and a very useless task to follow out this inquiry in relation to any great number of diseases. Let us consider it in its bearings upon two or three only; for, in truth, our limited space forbids us to allude to more. And for our illustrations, let us take those examples of disease which Sir John Herschel adduces in his "Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy," as instances for which the advancement of science of late years, has devised more or less certain means of removal and cure. These instances were, of course, originally cited by that author without any view to such a question as the present; and are hence free from the prejudice of selection. Sir John Herschel adduces as his illustrations, the treatment of the following four diseases, viz.: the cure of ague or intermittent fever by quinine; the arrestment of the ravages of small-pox by vaccination; the suppression of sea-scurvy in our fleets by lemon-juice, etc.; and the removal of goitres by the use of iodine. These examples are as good as any other, and for the present object the more apposite, inasmuch as the first in our enumeration, formed in Hahnemann's mind the alleged fact by which the doctrine of homœopathy was primarily suggested to him; and the second has been adduced by his disciples as the best-marked instance in favour of his doctrine.

Let us turn, first, to the cure of intermittent fever by cinchona bark, or the active principle of that bark, quinine; and consider whether this is, as it is alleged to be, one of the strongest possible proofs in favour of the doctrine of homœopathy.

*First Instance.—Cure of Ague by Quinine or Cinchona Bark.*¹—It was in attempting to ascertain how Cinchona or Peruvian bark cured ague or intermittent fever, that Hahnemann made his alleged discovery. In corroboration of this point, let me adduce the evidence of Dr J. Rutherford Russell, a homœopathic physician, far better acquainted with the literature of Hahnemannian medicine than most of his brethren are. The first article inserted in the first volume of the “British Journal of Homœopathy,” was a “Sketch of the Origin and Progress of Homœopathy,” by Dr Russell. In speaking of the first idea of homœopathy in Hahnemann’s mind, Dr Russell tells us the following now oft-repeated anecdote of its origin.

“Among numerous Italian, French, and English works which he (Hahnemann) translated, was Cullen’s ‘Materia Medica’ in 1790. Cullen’s description of the virtues of Cinchona rivetted his attention; and, dissatisfied with the author’s attempt to explain its power in checking intermittent fever, he determined to make experiments with the substance on himself. With this view he took, for several days successively, a considerable dose of it, AND AN INTERMITTENT FEVER ENSUED. The thought then struck him,—may not the power of this drug to cure ague depend upon its power of producing a similar disease?”—*Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. i. p. 3.²

Or let us take the circumstance as stated in a letter on homœopathy, published in 1851 in England, by an individual who tells us he was a personal friend and pupil of Hahnemann,—namely, Mr Everest. In a sufficiently abusive and non-reverend “letter to Dr Cormack,” Mr Everest, the Vicar of Wickwar, gives the following account of the origin of homœopathy in Hahnemann’s mind:—

“The world has been so often informed of the manner in which he began his discoveries, that I presume it has reached even yourself; yet suffer me to refer to it once more; it may not be altogether without profit. Dr Cullen had just published some accounts of the extraordinary cures of various kinds of ague by cinchona. The man whom you despise so much was employed in translating his work into German for the booksellers, for, having given up a profession which he could not conscientiously practise, he was very poor; and his thoughts one day fell on the subjects he had been reading. He thought, ‘Why does this substance cure these maladies?’ Alas! he could get no answer to the question; all was as dark before him as it must be to you, Sir, at present. The question was dismissed from his mind, but in vain; it returned with renewed force. He procured some of the substance in question.

¹ “Quinine, the essential principle in which reside the febrifuge qualities of the Peruvian bark, (is) a discovery by which posterity is yet to benefit in its full extent, but which has already begun to diffuse comparative comfort and health through regions almost desolated by pestiferous exhalations.”—*Herschel’s Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy*, p. 56.

² “He (Hahnemann) made the first trial on himself, by taking for some days four scruples of powdered cinchona twice a-day, and observed the symptoms which mark a well developed intermittent fever.”—*Fletcher’s Pathology*, edited by Drs Drysdale and Russell, p. 494.

He examined it, tasted it, weighed it; but there was still no answer. 'The depth said, it is not in me to say; and the sea said, it is not in me.' He took his hat, wandered forth alone, and meditated on the subject alone for hours, and all in vain. At length he thought, 'A certain quantity of this inert-looking powder will make a man strong who is attacked with a certain sort of weakness, and arrest his periodical shivering and concomitant sufferings; will it make me stronger, I wonder, if I take it?' He began a course of it, and one evening, after having taken a quantity of it for several successive days, *he was attacked with SHIVERING AND OTHER SYMPTOMS OF INTERMITTENT FEVER*, attended with much weakness and loss of appetite. He stopped his daily doses; his fever went away, and health returned. He tried it many times, and invariably with the same or similar results. Now, observe, if you please, 'FACT THE FIRST.' Cinchona gives a healthy man an intermittent fever, and cinchona cures intermittent fever in the sick."—*Mr Everest's Letter to Dr Cormack*, 1851.

Hahnemann's supposed discovery, then, regarding cinchona, was this—That cinchona cures intermittent fever in the sick, because cinchona, when taken in ordinary allopathic doses, gives a healthy man an intermittent fever, or symptoms similar to it. "Like cures like." Now, the imagined universal law, "*similia similibus curantur*," was here, as elsewhere, built upon a premise, or supposed observation, which itself is *not* a fact. "There are," according to the often-quoted remark of Cullen, "more false facts than even false theories in medicine." It is true, as a general fact, that cinchona cures ague; but it is *not* true that the use of cinchona produces ague. There is every reason to believe that it was owing to the preconceived hypothesis in Hahnemann's own mind, that *he* got ague symptoms from it. In Britain, for example, (or in any countries where there is no external marsh-malaria capable of producing ague, and hence liable to lead to fallacies in the observations), I am not aware that such a result has been observed by any physicians or any patients. And yet there is scarcely a British medical practitioner who has not exhibited cinchona or quinine to his patients hundreds of times. Among our population many thousands of individuals have taken the cinchona, or its concentrated principle quinine, and the alleged result—viz., the production of ague,—has many thousands of times failed. Indeed, most of the individuals in these islands who have been repeatedly sick (and who has not?), have taken, at one time or another, doses of cinchona or quinine as a tonic or otherwise. Has one of them ever had ague, or a disease like ague, produced by the use of this drug? I am informed that one house in London manufactures every year for medical uses about £30,000 worth of quinine. Does a single dose out of this vast quantity ever create ague in those to whom it is administered?

Perhaps it may occur to some minds as an objection to such an argument, that the cinchona and quinine did not lead to this effect—the production of ague—because the individuals taking it might not be perfectly healthy at the time of taking it. But Hahnemann himself admits, “that the provings or effects of medicine may be seen by watching the actions of them when given to the *sick*, particularly in chronic diseases, and even when given in doses as small as the 30th dilution.” Besides, many people have taken continuous doses of quinine to acquire increased tone and strength, even after they were in a state of comparatively good health; and not a few now of our officers and others serving on the coast of Africa, and in India, have (as was first, I believe, recommended by Dr Copeland) taken long courses of quinine without observing ague to follow its use.

Let me repeat it, that it is an undoubted general fact or therapeutic law, that the use of cinchona or quinine does *cure* ague; but, observation roundly and entirely contradicts the allegation of Hahnemann, that its use can also *produce* ague. And yet this last allegation was necessary in order that the law of “*similia similibus curantur*” be true. If the allegation, however, is untrue, as it certainly is, then this supposed infallible, universal law, is not infallible and universal; and in this, as in other instances, is not founded upon fact. Nor would it be at all relevant and logical to maintain, that if cinchona or quinine did *produce* ague (which is altogether questionable and doubtful) in ten or twenty exceptional instances out of the many many thousands of people who yearly take it, these rare and *exceptional* observations would be sufficient as a basis and groundwork for the Hahnemannian universal law. A universal, infallible law, like the “*similia similibus*,” cannot thus admit of infinitely more true instances of exception than true instances of confirmation, either in the premises upon which it is built, or in the results which it comprehends. Far less can it be primarily founded upon a few rare and *exceptional* observations as its deliberate data or premises. Even admit, for the sake of argument, that the cinchona or quinine could, in an extremely rare case now and then—as 1 in 1000, or 1 in 100,000, or 1 in 100,000,000—produce ague, or symptoms similar to it, would the extremely rare and *exceptional* occurrence of these symptoms be any reason, on any principle of philosophy or logic, for the foundation and establishment of a universal law? An exceptional phenomenon cannot be the foundation of any universal law in therapeutics or in any

other science. The exceptional occurrence of ague symptoms when cinchona is used (if ever such symptoms *do* occur from such a cause) would be no adequate basis to build a universal law of cure upon.¹

The homœopathists are fond of likening Hahnemann to Newton, and of comparing the universal law of "like cures like," suggested by the German physician, with the universal law of the gravitation of matter, propounded by the English philosopher. In the same paper by Dr Russell, "On the Origin and Progress of Homœopathy," from which I have already quoted the account of Hahnemann producing ague in himself by taking doses of cinchona, Dr Russell observes—

"The IDEA that medicines owed their powers of cure to a power of exciting a disease similar to the one they cured, was given by observing *an ague excited by cinchona*. But Hahnemann did not jump at his conclusion from this one observation, but sought to find in all other specifics some relation between the diseases they cured, and the effects they produced on those in health. And we must remember that his mind was on the watch for some indication. Shall we, then, blame him for attaching undue importance to one experiment? As well might we blame Newton for resting his law of gravitation on the apple's fall. In both cases, the original observation was but the finger-post of the road to truth."—*British Journal of Homœopathy*, Jan. 1843, vol. i. p. 12.

But the said "finger-post" points to two very different orders of data, or rather in two very different and opposite directions, in the two instances thus compared together. The *fall* of the apple towards the earth was found, on further consideration, not only to hold invariably true of this, but invariably true of all other similar material bodies. "There were (observes Dr Abercrombie) at one time certain apparent EXCEPTIONS to the universality of this law (of gravitation), namely, in some very light bodies which were not observed to fall. But a little further observation showed that these are prevented falling by being lighter than the atmosphere, and that in vacuo they observe the same law as the heaviest bodies. The apparent exceptions being thus brought under the law, it became general, namely, the fact *universally* true, that all unsupported bodies fall to the earth."² The production, however, of ague, or of

¹ After speaking of Hahnemann himself taking "repeated doses of decoction of bark," and producing ague in his own person, another homœopathic writer observes—"This phenomenon made upon his mind an impression similar to that which the fall of the apple made upon the mind of Newton; and from this attack of fever, thus artificially produced, may be dated the ORIGIN of homœopathy."—*Irish Homœopathic Society's View of Homœopathy*, p. 11. For the same comparison, see also Dr Madden's Pamphlet on *Homœopathy and Medical Reform*, Preface, p. x., etc.

² Dr Abercrombie's *Inquiry concerning the Intellectual Powers*, p. 434.

an affection like ague, in one person by the use of *einehona*-bark or quinine, does not hold invariably or generally true in relation to the use of the same medicine by other persons, or by the community at large. In fact, the occurrence of ague in mankind from the use of quinine, so very far from being a general fact, is at best but a rare, a very rare, EXCEPTION to the great general fact, that the use of quinine does NOT produce ague, or symptoms of ague, in the human constitution. And instead of the fall of the apple, and the appearance of ague symptoms from *einehona* resembling each other as primary facts or observations leading on respectively to the development of the laws of gravitation and homœopathy, they are as opposite and dissimilar as it is possible to conceive. The fall of the apple, etc., is *invariably true*, and without any exception. The production of ague by *einehona* is, on the contrary, almost if not, *invariably untrue*, and is at best not a general law, but a very, very rare exception to a very general law.

In fact, the analogy or supposed analogy between the laws of gravitation and homœopathy would be far more true and complete, if taken in a very different view from the preceding. For as rationally and as logically might some eccentric philosopher dream of building a universal law of REPULSION of matter (in opposition to Newton's universal law of its attraction or gravitation), by adducing in favour of this alleged "infallible," "unerring," universal law of repulsion, the *exceptional* case of the *ascent* of the balloon, in opposition to the constant observation of the *descent* of the apple and of other material bodies to the earth, as Hahnemann could build a universal, "eternal, unchangeable" law of cure by similars upon the rare *exceptional* case of the apparent production of ague by the remedy which cures ague, in opposition to the general fact and law that the use of that drug does not cause that disease. Man is usually born with five digits upon each hand and foot. Sometimes, however, and as a rare exception to this, there is seen an additional finger or even two on each hand, or an additional toe or two on each foot. But would this rare and exceptional occurrence be regarded by any sane anatomist or zoologist as a sufficient and adequate reason for declaring it as a high, general, or universal law, that man was a six-fingered and six-toed, or a seven-toed or seven-fingered animal? And yet it is by reasoning in this way on rare exceptions, and by converting these exceptions into alleged "general laws," that Hahnemann and his followers have arrived at most of their principal conclusions

in the so-called science of homœopathy. They forget, I repeat, that a general law or general fact can never be based upon exceptions, and that, on the contrary, a law of even the very lowest degree or type of generality must be abandoned altogether as a law, when, as in this instance, the exceptions against it are infinitely more numerous than the instances in favour of it. The premises upon which any high general or universal law is built (such as the law of *similia similibus* is held to be by homœopaths) must be *constant*, and not exceptional, phenomena. "Every REAL medicine," says Hahnemann himself (and if any medicine deserves that name, certainly cinchona or quinine merits it), "every real medicine acts at *all* times, and under *all* circumstances, on every living human being, and produces in him the symptoms peculiar to it, distinctly perceptible if the dose be large enough, so that evidently every living human organism is liable to be affected, and, as it were, inoculated, with the medicinal disease at any time, and absolutely (unconditionally), which, as before said, is by no means the case with the natural diseases."¹ When judged by this criterion of Hahnemann, there can be but one conclusion,—viz., that cinchona does *not* produce ague or a disease analogous to ague; and that in relation to it, the "infallible," "unerring" law of *similia similibus* does not hold good.

Nay more, I believe we may go one step farther in relation to the action of cinchona or quinine. No one can doubt, that as a general law, the large doses of cinchona, or the corresponding doses of quinine, given by physicians, arrest and cure ague. Rest, and a change of diet and habitation, will often alone cure the milder cases of the disease.² But there are few if any points in the

¹ Organon, p. 132.

² As evidence of this fact, and of the great care required in drawing correct deductions from therapeutic observations, let me quote the following statement from Professor Chomel of Paris:—"The Common Holly having been much praised as a remedy for intermittent fever, M. Chomel determined to make trial of it in the clinical wards of the Hospital La Charité. Accordingly, he requested the officers of the Bureau Central, an establishment where nearly all the patients are admitted in the Parisian Hospitals, to send him some cases of that disease. *Twenty-two* cases were, in consequence, directed to him. After their admission, he purposely abstained from all treatment for several days, in order to assure himself of the correctness of the diagnosis, and to ascertain that the paroxysms were neither suspended nor diminished by the altered circumstances of the patients. He found, that of the twenty-two, *seven* never had another paroxysm, *four* had paroxysms of decreasing intensity, and *eight* had nothing but symptomatic paroxysms, connected

general laws of therapeutics more certain, than the removal of all *curable* cases of ague by the use of cinchona or quinine, given in the ordinary doses and by ordinary physicians. In Vienna, however, and elsewhere, where the disease is prevalent, the infinitesimal doses of cinchona or quinine recommended by Hahnemann, as a necessary offshoot of his doctrine of "*similia similibus*," are not found to cure ague like the large ordinary doses of the same drug. "In corroboration, we might (observes Dr Balfour) quote the confessions of the homœopaths themselves, or of those who have been reconverted to allopathy. Thus Koff states, that this disease can neither be certainly, quickly, nor pleasantly cured by the infinitesimals. Nay, he (Koff) quotes avowed homœopaths, Gross, Rummell, Uegidi, and Hauptmann, to the same effect." "What (asks Dr Balfour) are we to think of a system, whose very foundation-stone is so unstable! For, as is well known, it was the action of cinchona that first led Hahnemann to *think* of his new theory."¹

with slight inflammation of the mucous membranes, which yielded to simple anti-phlogistic remedies; *three* only were fit subjects for experiment, *i. e.* had essential intermittent fever, preserving all its intensity in the three or four paroxysms following their admission. The remedy (the Holly) was given to these at first in the dose recommended; the quantity was then doubled, quadrupled, and octupled, without any appreciable effect. The sulphate of quinine was then given in the ordinary way, and the paroxysms were *immediately* stopped. If, from the day of admission, the remedy had been given to all, or even only to those who had essential intermittent fever, we would have concluded, that it had cured nineteen out of twenty-two, or, at least, eleven in fourteen, and would have regarded the remaining three cases—the only ones proper to test the remedy—as exceptional ones."—See the *Lancet* for 1841-2, p. 107.

¹ British and Foreign Medical Review, vol. xxiii. p. 608. Dr Bushnan ingeniously suggests to the homœopaths the following practical and pecuniary application of their infinitesimal doctrines in relation to cinchona,—"*Cinchona* bark (says he) is becoming more scarce every day, and its market price, consequently, increasing; while, from the greater intercourse of Europeans with hot climates, the necessity of obtaining this precious drug is also daily on the increase. Immense quantities are consumed by the French army in Africa, where the expense incurred by the supply of quinine is enormously great. Hence the French government has offered a large reward to any one who may discover a cheap substitute for quinine; and there can be little doubt, but that the happy discoverer would be gratified with a share of the saving produced, which would amount to several thousands yearly. Being of those who desire to practise the sublime precept of returning good for evil, we would direct the attention of our metropolitan homœopaths to this point. The speculation is worth looking after. If a pennyworth of quinine be sufficient to cure, of intermittent fever, the whole world to the end of time—the dilution becoming more efficacious with each gallon of fluid you add to

Second instance.—Vaccination and its Effects upon Small-pox.
 —The second instance adduced by Sir John Herschel of the power of medicine over human maladies, is the suppression of small-pox by Dr Jenner's discovery of vaccination. Certainly it would be impossible to adduce a more striking instance of the triumph of medicine over the ravages of disease; for, if small-pox prevailed now as much in Britain amongst our present increased population, as it prevailed among the smaller population of the last century, and before vaccination was discovered, about 80,000 individuals would die from it annually in England and Scotland alone; and, as I have already stated in a preceding page, this single discovery in medicine, has probably already saved millions of human lives.

Hahnemann and his followers allege, that the prevention of small-pox by vaccination is a striking instance of the operation of the infallible law of homœopathy.¹ But most assuredly it is not an instance in the slightest degree in favour of that law.

In order to cure a disease, by means of a similar affection developed by a homœopathically chosen remedy, we should, according to Hahnemann, excite in the body, an artificial or "medicinal disease somewhat *greater* in degree" than the natural disease which we wish to remove. (*Organon*, p. 41.) The physician, he elsewhere

it, and the 'succussions,' moreover, costing little—why not become candidates for the French prize? Why not propose to supply the French army in Africa with an infallible remedy, costing less than a farthing, and endowed with miraculous properties? You cannot fail to demonstrate the truth of your system; the government cannot shut its eyes against the light; *you* will receive a reward superior to the sum of your united practices in London, and *we* will have a happy riddance of you."—*Homœopathy and the Homœopaths*, p. 193.

¹ This (vaccination) is an operation purely homœopathic, and one which, from its efficacy in the prevention of a disease exhibiting analogous symptoms has been frequently quoted by our Great Founder and his disciples, as one of the best illustrations of the immutable law," etc.—*Dr Laurie's Homœopathic Domestic Medicine*, p. 728. See also *View of Homœopathy*, published by the Irish Homœopathic Society, p. 17; etc. But, it may be added, a homœopathic physician, Bönninghausen, "actually proposed to present a petition to government praying for the suppression of vaccination, as he believed it to be a fertile source of chronic disease, and he had found that *Thuja* (200th dilution) was a perfect specific for small-pox of the most violent character, preventing all pock-marks."—*Journal of Homœopathy* for 1851, p. 350. On the contrary, Trinks, another homœopathist, found in small-pox at Dresden, that *Thuja* was not "of the slightest use."—*Ibid.*, p. 504. And Dr Henriques states his belief, that "no specific for small-pox is known in homœopathy."—*Ibid.*, p. 503. Such is the alleged "harmony" among the disciples of the "eternal, unchangeable, infallible law," *similia similibus curantur*.

observes, "affects the vital force in a stronger manner by a potency that produces a disease very similar, but *stronger*." (P. 128.)¹ When, however, we use as a preventive of small-pox, artificial inoculation with small-pox (variola), or artificial inoculation with cow-pox (vaccination), the artificial disease is not, what is hypothetically required by the homœopathic law, a *greater* or *stronger* disease than the small-pox itself. Besides, when small-pox inoculation was used, as was very generally and very successfully done in the last century, to prevent small-pox (and has been lately proposed to be done again by some modern physicians, as Drs Copland, Gregory, and Trousseau), the remedy thus employed did not produce symptoms merely *similar* to small-pox, but symptoms *identical* with it. In fact, the two diseases were identical and the same. The effect, if explicable in this way at all, was not certainly an effect of the homœopathic law *similia similibus curantur*,—of like cured by like ; but rather of the isopathic law of Ianz,—viz., of the same disease cured by the same, *equalia equalibus curantur*.² And the same remark may be extended to the present practice of vaccination, seeing that almost all pathologists are now agreed, that small-pox and cow-pox are identically the same disease, with this difference, that the cow-pox has been modified by passing through the body of the cow, but can be reproduced again in the cow by exposing it fully to the contagion of human small-pox.

In truth, however, the prevention of small-pox by artificial variolation and vaccination, depends altogether on a different law, from that of *similia similibus* or *equalia equalibus*. And the law is one with which the public, as well as the profession, have long been intimate. It is simply this,—that one attack of certain specific contagious diseases, as measles, scarlet fever, hooping-cough, plague, etc., generally destroys, for the remainder of life, the liability in the individual attacked, to a repetition of the same disease. In other words, these are non-recurrent affections. When a child is attacked, for example,

¹ See other quotations from the "Organon" to the same effect in a preceding page (p. 209).

² Hahnemann himself more than once distinctly lays it down, that (to quote his own words), "the homœopathic doctrine *never* pretended to cure a disease by the *same*, the *identical* power by which the disease was produced ; but by means of a medicine that possesses the peculiar power of being able to produce a *similar* morbid state."—(See his *Lesser Writings*, p. 743.) "If (he again remarks) the two were not merely of a *similar* but of the *same* nature, consequently identical, then no result, or only an aggravation of the malady, would follow."—*Ibid*, p. 708.

with measles, it is rarely, in after-life, attacked with measles a second time. The prevention of measles, however, in this way, by a previous attack of measles, or the prevention of scarlet fever by a previous attack of scarlet fever, is most assuredly no instance of the homœopathic law, that like is cured by like. No homœopathist even ever propounded such an untenable doctrine. Neither on the same ground is the prevention of small-pox by previous artificial attacks of small-pox (variola-tion,) or of cow-pox (vaccination,) any example of the operation of that law.

Third instance.—Prevention and Cure of Sea-Scurvy by Lemon-juice.—The third illustration adduced by Sir John Herschel, is the prevention and cure of sea-scurvy by lemon-juice, etc. In speaking of the former ravages produced in our fleets by sea-scurvy, as compared with the present state of our navy, Sir John Herschel remarks :—

“Hardly inferior to this scourge (of small-pox) on land was, within the last seventy or eighty years, the scurvy at sea. The sufferings and destruction produced by this horrid disorder on board our ships, when, as a matter of course, it broke out after a few months’ voyage, seem now almost incredible. Deaths, to the amount of eight or ten a day, in a moderate ship’s company; bodies sewn up in hammocks, and washing about the decks for the want of strength and spirits on the part of the miserable survivors to cast them overboard; and every form of loathsome and excruciating misery of which the human frame is susceptible:—such are the pictures which the narratives of nautical adventure in those days continually offer. . . . So tremendous were the ravages of scurvy, that in the year 1726, Admiral Hosier sailed with seven ships of the line to the West Indies, and buried his ships’ companies twice, and died himself, in consequence, of a broken heart. . . . In 1780, the number of cases of scurvy received into Haslar Hospital was 1457; in 1806, *one* only; and, in 1807, *one*. There are now many surgeons in the navy who have never seen the disease.”¹

Few facts are better ascertained and more universally acknowledged than this,—that lemon-juice, and the use of fresh succulent fruits and vegetables, form not only the best preventives, but also

¹ Herschel’s Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy, p. 52.

the best and most certain cures for sea-scurvy. No man, I believe, has any doubt that the use of lemon-juice, or the use of fresh salads or fruits, would cure any common uncomplicated case of scurvy. But no man, so far as I know, has ever observed the use of lemon-juice produce the disease which it can thus cure; though it ought to do so often and constantly, if the homœopathic law were a true, “unerring, infallible” law as Hahnemann and his followers aver it to be.¹

“Scurvy, says Dr Watson, is infallibly and rapidly cured by the administration of lemon-juice, or of other fresh fruits and vegetables.”²

But again, while the use of fresh and succulent vegetables, such as salads, fruits, etc., will almost infallibly *cure* any common case of scurvy, certainly the daily use of salad or fruits by the general community does not *produce* in them that disease, or any morbid affection or state similar to that disease; and yet, I repeat, such a diet ought to have such an effect, provided there were any truth in what Hahnemann terms his “infallible, eternal law of nature.”

Fourth instance.—Cure of Goitre by the exhibition of Iodine.—The last instance mentioned by Sir John Herschel is the use of iodine in discussing and removing goitre from the neck or thyroid gland. “The result,” says he, “establishes the extraordinary fact, that this singular substance, taken as a medicine, acts with the utmost promptitude and energy on *goitre*, dissipating the largest and most inveterate in a short time, and acting (of course like all medicines, even the most approved, with occasional failures) as a specific, or natural antagonist, against that odious deformity.”³ In consonance with the unerring law of homœopathy, this drug, which thus removes goitrous swelling of the neck, ought also to produce an affection similar to *goitre* in the neck or thyroid gland. But though preparations of iodine are used most extensively in medical

¹ I am aware, that on theoretical grounds Dr Stevens supposes that the use of lemon-juice should produce scurvy, and he fancied he had seen such an effect; but I believe that neither he nor any one else ever really observed that disease to result from the use of lemon-juice. Occasionally scurvy may have been seen in sailors who had been using the lemon-juice; but in such instances the *deficient* quantity or quality of the lemon-juice was the cause; just as small-pox will occasionally occur after vaccination, from the vaccination being defective or imperfect. But in such circumstances it would be a wild and strange logic that would hold that the vaccination was the *cause* of the small-pox, or the lemon-juice was the *cause* of the scurvy.

² Dr Watson's *Lectures on the Practice of Physic* (1848). Vol. ii. p. 860.

³ Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy, p. 51.

practice for other diseases (about L.50,000 of iodine being manufactured annually in Great Britain for medical purposes alone), no one, I believe, has ever seen the drug produce this affection, or any affection in any degree similar to it, in the neck or in the thyroid gland; which it ought constantly to do, under these circumstances, if there were truth in the homœopathic law. We are told, however, by the homœopaths, that some day they expect to see an instance in which the use of Iodine will coincide with an enlargement of the thyroid gland, or with symptoms of goitre. And they argue that this "coming" case will prove that the action of Iodine is homœopathic;—illogically arguing, in this as in other instances, that any such rare exception, provided it ever did occur, ought to be received as a general and universal fact. As well, and as logically, might a naturalist take it upon him to aver, as a general law, that man was actually a treble-headed animal; and, in confirmation of it, tell us that he was merely waiting for an instance of the birth of such a human monstrosity showing three heads, believing that such an occurrence would prove the truth of his supposed generalisation.

Before leaving this subject, let me further observe, that we have already found Hahnemann declaring that "the method *ab usu in morbis* can never be of the slightest use to the practitioner, and can never reveal anything true and useful of the curative powers of each medicinal substance."—(See antecedently, p. 181.) Now the cure of goitre by Iodine has not, and cannot be revealed, by any experiments on the healthy subject; but has been revealed, like the medicinal effects of many other of our principal drugs, by their use in diseases alone. We know, from the notices of burnt sponge as a remedy for goitre, mentioned by Arnold de Villeneuve and other old authors, that Iodine has been used in this form, from time immemorial, by those affected with goitre in Switzerland, and in other parts of Europe. Those suffering from it in South America seem, from medical experience, to have discovered also the uses of matters containing Iodine in the same affection. The stems of a sea-weed, and without doubt containing Iodine, have been long chewed by the inhabitants of South America, under the name of Palo-coto, or Goitre-stick, wherever goitre is prevalent. I am informed by Dr Greville, that Dr Gillies found this drug carried over the Pampas of South America, many hundreds of miles inland, for this medicinal use. Here we have the same medicinal agent, Iodine, used by people suffering under the same affection in very different

and distant parts of the world; and their faith in it founded, no doubt, merely upon their experience of its good effects in the treatment and removal of this disease in those affected by it; from experiments with it upon the diseased, and not upon the healthy subject.

The preceding instances, and they might easily be multiplied if necessary, are perhaps sufficient to show, that the alleged *universal* law of *similia similibus*, is by no means infallible and universal, as it was and is maintained to be by Hahnemann and his supporters. Hahnemann has himself shown, by quotations from various authors, that the law of *similia similibus curantur* was, from time to time, suggested by practitioners and writers, from Hippocrates downwards, as one of the *general* laws of therapeutics. I have said enough, I believe, to show that it is not a *universal* law; and I believe that, with few, if any, exceptions, all our most distinguished pathologists and physicians entirely doubt if it is even one of the lowest *general* laws in therapeutics, or has in truth any claim to the title of a law at all. It would be a valuable general law, if it could be proved to be such; but adequate evidence is altogether wanting even to that effect. No doubt we find that a drug, such as a solution of nitrate of silver, when dropped into the eye, will produce a form of inflammation of the eye, and that a similar solution is, in conjunction with other appropriate remedial means, frequently used by oculists for the cure of catarrhal and other inflammatory affections in that organ. But all adequate proof is wanting, capable of showing that the mere curative effect, which the medicine possesses over the inflammation, has *any connection whatever* with its morbid power of producing the inflammation; or the reverse. In other words, we have no evidence that the drug has the power of curing, merely because it has the power of producing, inflammatory disease of the eye. There is no probable, and certainly no proved, relation of cause and effect between these two coincidences; no more than there is any proved or probable relation of cause and effect between the fact of roast-beef or mutton *curing* the faintness of hunger in most men, because they *produce* a feeling of faintness in some few idiosyncracies.¹ In none of the cases of *similia similibus* adduced by homœopathists, is the sequence of production and cure a constant sequence. It is always, as we have repeatedly stated, an *exceptional*, and often

¹ See on this point the instances quoted at p. 222.

a rare, coincidence only. But even the *constancy* of the sequence or coincidence, were it well marked, would not necessarily prove the connection between the phenomena to be of the relation of cause and effect. "Night follows day, and day follows night; but night is not the cause of day, nor day the cause of night."

To show this want of causal relation in the alleged cases of *similia similibus*, let us take another instance in illustration. Hahnemann, and other homœopathists, often adduce, in supposed corroboration of the truth of the principle *similia similibus curantur*, the fact, that in "recent cases of frost-bitten limbs, frozen sour-cROUT is applied, and frictions of snow are used."—(*Organon*, p. 100.) In this instance, the good effect derived from the frequent frictions of snow, is not truly explicable on the principle that "like cures like," but is explicable on other acknowledged therapeutic principles. The frictions with the snow do not cure the frost-bite in *consequence* of the fact of an excessive cold having originally produced the frost-bite, as the law of *similia similibus* presupposes. There are not two kinds of cold. Cold as a medicine applied to a frost-bitten part, would not, hence, be the application of a *like* remedy, but of an agent identically the *same* as the morbid cause. The homœopathic law, as explained by Hahnemann, maintains that the *like medicinal agent* must, as we have already seen, be *stronger* in degree than the *original disease*. But the degree of cold of snow-frictions is not greater than the degree of cold in a frost-bitten part. Parts of a healthy human body are seldom frost-bitten, till the temperature in them is reduced twenty or thirty degrees below the freezing point,—say, for the sake of argument, to zero in Fahrenheit's scale. A quantity of snow held in the human hand, and applied to the frost-bitten part, rapidly acquires a heat of 32° or above it, for it rapidly melts in the hand. Hence the medicinal cold thus applied, is not, I repeat (as the homœopathic law considers necessary), "greater" than the original amount of cold or disease in the frost-bitten part, but is quite the reverse. In reality, however, the true explanation is quite a different one from the law of *similia similibus curantur*. It is a general fact or law, that when extreme degrees of cold or heat are applied to the exposed parts of the human body, the subsequent deleterious effect is greatly modified according to the degree of rapidity, or slowness, with which the part is allowed to return to the natural temperature of the body. If the frost-bitten part at the temperature of zero,

were suddenly exposed to the temperature of a room at 60° Fahrenheit, the part would, in consequence of the re-action produced, inflame, and perhaps slough and die. But when it is allowed only gradually to return to the natural temperature of the body, or the natural temperature of the room, by the *intermediate* degree of heat conveyed by snow-frictions being applied to it, this mischance is in a great degree obviated. In this case we see, that the explanation of the good effects of the snow-friction, on the frost-bitten part, is not referable to the apparent *coincidence* of “like curing like,” but is referable to a different law. And, in truth, the coincidence itself of *similia similibus*, is here, as in other cases, apparent only, and not real,—a temperature of 32°, such as is produced by the snow-frictions, being to the frost-bitten part at zero comparatively an application of *heat*, and not of cold; and the instance itself is merely an example of the common fact, that the apparent coincidence of *similia similibus* is in this as in other examples referable to other acknowledged therapeutic laws.

But, for the sake of illustration, let us for a moment take Hahnemann at his own word, and let us allow that the application of snow to a part frost-bitten by cold air may, or can, cure the frost-bitten part homœopathically, on the principle *similia similibus curantur*. Then, according to Hahnemann’s repeated tenets and opinions, two subsidiary conditions are necessary in order that this or any other homœopathic cures be effected, viz.—first, the medicine must be “*stronger*” than the disease,¹ or, in other words, the remedial degree of cold must be “*greater*” than the morbid degree of it in the affected part; and secondly, further, lest the remedy do harm, and aggravate the disease instead of relieving it, the dose of the remedy of cold ought, according to Hahnemann, to be the very smallest possible dose, as a billionth or decillionth of a grain of a drug, and, consequently, an equal part of a degree of Raumur or Fahrenheit;—consequently, a billionth or decillionth of a degree of cold lower, and hence “*stronger*,” than the actual degree of it which has produced the frost-bite in the nose, fingers, or toes of the affected person, ought to be the amount of cold kept locally applied for the cure, homœopathically, of these affected parts. It needs, however, little thought or reasoning to predetermine, that these frost-bitten parts would only the more speedily be attacked with mortification and

¹ On this point, see the opinions of Hahnemann already quoted at p. 209, etc.

death, if, when once frost-bitten with cold, they were kept, for cure, exposed to the same or to a greater degree of cold, as the homœopathic doctrine requires. Will any disciples of Hahnemann venture to show their faith in Hahnemann's doctrine of *similia similibus curantur*, by allowing their noses, or fingers, or toes to be first duly frost-bitten by exposure to air of a temperature of zero, and then submit these parts to be cured homœopathically, by having them retained in a degree of cold, amongst snow or otherwise, "greater" and "stronger" than the natural degree of cold which produced the frost-bite, until (according to Hahnemann's explanation, p. 213) the remedy "cause and compel" the instinctive vital force "to increase its energy," so as to remove the original diseased amount of cold or frost-bite? No doubt there are persons with minds so confiding and credulous, and so heartily enamoured by anything affecting, like homœopathy, to bear, though spuriously, the name of science, that the loss even of their own features, or of their own extremities, by the mortification of the parts necessarily following such a frost-bite, would not carry conviction to their minds, however much it might damage and mutilate their bodies. There are others, however, whom such an *argumentum ad hominem* would possibly convince.

As a foundation for the application of the universal law, "Like cures like," in practice, Hahnemann and others have themselves, as we have already seen,¹ taken doses of different medicines, and marked all the symptoms which they could observe in their own bodies and minds for some days or weeks after swallowing them, hoping by the knowledge thus acquired to be able afterwards in practice to select their medicines according to the principle of similitude. In writing down records of these supposed symptoms, produced by the drugs taken, they doubtlessly often, or indeed generally, noted merely those mental nervous and bodily symptoms which constantly occur in the human body without the use of drugs; and more especially occur, if we have our attention set in watch for the presence and discovery of them. No doubt the desire and the expectation of these symptoms will often conjure up their occurrence. I have known simple bread-pills act as aperients, as diaphoretics, as diuretics, as narcotics, etc., when the patients who used them swallowed them under the mental impression and conviction that they

¹ See Chapter X., pp. 66-77.

were drugs calculated to produce these special effects. In one case, with which I have been made acquainted, salivation and spongy gums followed the use of bread pills—the patient believing that his medical attendant was exhibiting to him, what he had experienced before, an active course of mercury.¹

Hahnemann in all probability took symptoms of ague when he first experimentally used the cinchona bark, *because* he expected, if not actually desired, these symptoms to occur. Many of the “provings” of drugs were made by Hahnemann himself; and his countryman, Isensee, avers that Hahnemann’s alleged symptoms “may all be referred to sobriety, fasting, ill-humour, and sleepiness, caused by continued attention to—NOTHING, mixed with those innumerable sensations which crowd every hour of our life.”²

¹ Some experiments made at Paris, when, a few years ago, the question of homœopathy was raised in that school, show how much the action of the homœopathic drug is a mere mental or imaginary effect. These experiments consisted of giving to patients pills made of inert substances. Thus, for example, in a case of loss of voice, aphonia, two *starch* undrugged pills were given. “A few minutes after the first pill had been swallowed, the following symptoms manifested themselves:—Anxiety, pain and uneasiness in the region of the heart and thorax, perspiration, with heat and eruption on the skin. The second pill appeared to aggravate these symptoms, with the addition of hiccough. She afterwards fell asleep, and on awaking was astonished to find she could talk in a loud tone.” The complaint did not recur. In another case a man aged 48, had exhibited to him four starch pills, which he believed to be homœopathic remedies. “Half an hour after swallowing each pill, the patient experienced anxiety, sense of oppression, and spitting of blood. The pills were discontinued and resumed on alternate days during a fortnight. Each time they were taken they were followed by oppression, headache, acceleration of pulse, diuresis, and pains in the limbs.”—For these and other cases and experiments, see *Mr Lee’s Pamphlet*, pp. 12, 13, etc.—For additional similar observations on the mental effects of tractors, etc., etc., see antecedently, pp. 85, 86, etc. Dr Forbes Winslow in his work on the “Preservation of Health of Body and Mind,” relates the following instance of the fatal effects even of a mere word or name upon the human organism,—“A weak-minded man, a clergyman, drinking wine in company, swallowed (says Dr Winslow) a bit of sealing-wax, when one of his companions seeing him alarmed, to increase his terror, jocularly called out, ‘It will SEAL up your bowels.’ From that instant he became melancholy, and in a day or two refused all nourishment. On being pressed to give a reason for this refusal, he said he knew that nothing would go through him. He was, however, induced to take a cathartic, which operated freely; nevertheless, he could not be convinced, but that his body was hermetically sealed, and, with the exception of a little broth, which he was frightened into taking, he refused to swallow anything, and died in consequence.”

² Dr Forbes’ Review, vol. xxii. p. 568. See the proved delusions in a preceding chapter, p. 77, etc.

In these experiments or “provings,”¹ as they are termed, upon drugs, the immense number of the symptoms stated to be produced in the human body by one drug, is proof itself that the medicament was not the cause of these symptoms. For instance, 1090 symptoms are recorded as the effects of some doses of oyster-shell; 1242 as the effects of the ink of the cuttle fish; 1143 as the effects of china (quinine;) 930 distinct symptoms are recorded as produced by doses of common charcoal, a substance which is quite insoluble and inert in doses of drachms, but which Hahnemann alleges he *makes* medicinal by his triturations. And the specific effects of the various drugs upon the constitution, are averred to last for long periods. Charcoal, colocynth, and alum produce symptoms for 40 days; and Jahr describes, indeed, above 50 drugs, the effects of which continue for a month or longer, the alleged effects during that time being, as might well be expected, very contradictory. Thus opium, belladonna, cannabis, phosphorus, lead,

¹ A few months ago, I was informed by one of the most esteemed and distinguished of living physicians, that a patient of his was induced to consult a homœopathist of “great repute,” regarding her child, who was hopelessly epileptic. The homœopathist held out the strongest promises of relief and cure; and as the mother was a novice in homœopathy, and sceptical regarding its principles, the homœopathic physician volunteered to show her “a proving” that would convince her of the truth of Hahnemannism. He swallowed a globule from his drug-box, went on talking with the lady for a few minutes, and then suddenly fell down with a shriek and convulsions like a person in epilepsy—thus temporarily convincing the deluded mother that homœopathy possessed drugs actually capable of *producing* symptoms like the symptoms of epilepsy. The homœopathist continued in attendance till he had drawn from the deluded patient a large sum in fees; when the mother, finding no benefit whatever accrue, at last sent again for her old physician (my informant). I do believe and hope that few, even among homœopathists, would stoop to so dishonourable a trick as this; for I believe that many among those who practise homœopathy have (sometimes with good natural talents) such a supercredulous, wondering, transcendental, sea-serpentine cast of mind as actually and honestly to have faith in it; they are by nature mentally constituted so as specially and almost irresistibly to credit and patronise everything particularly extreme, mystic and marvellous; they are spurious hyper-philosophers who constantly talk—and write too—of the necessity of following the Bæonian method of investigation, while they as constantly and systematically (and it may be unwittingly) set it and its principles utterly at defiance. As certainly, however, there are other physicians who have adopted, or affected to adopt, the tenets and practice of Hahnemann, not so much from conviction, as because they lamentably failed in success when pursuing the more difficult and honourable, but far slower, path of legitimate medicine, and who have no scruples in using homœopathy, in any way, simply as a means of income and money—“*Rem, recte si possis, sin non ullo modo—rem.*”—See *Dr Hooker's Remarks* cited previously, p. 32.

etc., and various other homœopathic drugs, have entered under the proved effects of each the power of producing diarrhœa and the power of producing the opposite state of constipation. Vegetable charcoal, animal oil, berberis, cantharis, etc., produce both drowsiness and sleeplessness. Belladonna, pulsatilla, nux vomica, etc. etc., produce both want of appetite and hunger, or excess of appetite; and so on with various other symptoms and various other remedies. Under the very same remedy the homœopaths thus enter sometimes long and contradictory series of symptoms. Thus, for example, according to Jahr, doses of oyster-shell (*calcareæ carbonicæ*) cause both "quotidian fever towards two o'clock in the afternoon," and "tertian fever in the evening;" doses of this same drug cause both dulness in the sense of smell, and exceeding sensibility in the sense of smell; both "dry coryza" and "fluid coryza;" both paleness and redness of the face; both hollowness and puffiness of it; both dryness of the mouth and salivation; both hunger and distaste for food; both sensations of burning and sensations of cold in the abdomen, etc. etc. etc.¹ This superabundance of symptoms, and even of the most opposite symptoms, under almost every "proved" medicine, has one result,—viz., that when any one drug produces (as they allege many can do), 200, 500, or 1000 symptoms,² it is easy (by a piece of self-deceiving casuistry on the part of those who favour homœopathy) to allege that they can find the *counterpart* symptoms or *similia* of almost every disease, in any remedy which is known, by the experience of ordinary physicians, to be useful in the treatment of that disease. For instance, if oyster-shell were a cure for 40 or 50 diseases, could they not easily find the principal counterpart symptoms or *similia* of these 40 or 50 diseases among the alleged 1000 effects or symptoms which the "provings" of these drugs are asserted by them to have produced?

I doubt if all the known symptoms of all diseases, as laid down in our works of Symptomatology, amount to above a thousand in all;

¹ See Jahr's "Manual of Homœopathic Medicines" (London, 1847), under these different heads.

² Sometime ago, I read of a credulous physician convincing himself of the truth of homœopathy by himself taking doses of some homœopathic drugs, and finding, to his great "surprise," that several of the symptoms which he felt were among those already marked in the homœopathic books under the two or three drugs he used. Would it not have been *infinitely* more a matter of "surprise" if, among the many hundred symptoms entered under each of the drugs this simple gentleman experimented on, he had *not* found the symptoms which he fancied to be produced in himself?

and the so-called "proved" effects of many of the drugs used by the homœopathists, particularly of their so-called polychrest drugs, as chalk, silex, charcoal, aconite, pulsatilla, sulphur, etc. etc., could easily be so arranged as to mimic more or less completely most diseases of the human frame. In all this, however, homœopathic practitioners pursue a system of similitudes far more imaginary than real; and one calculated, by a spurious mode of reasoning only, to satisfy themselves of the existence of the fancied similitude of the effects of the drug used, to the disease against which it is used.¹

Hahnemann and his disciples maintain, as a general principle and tenet, that we should and must derive our knowledge of the special medicinal symptoms, or "artificial diseases" produced by each particular drug, from experiments with it on the healthy human body.

¹ *Homœopathy Applied to Veterinary Practice*.—Some enthusiastic disciples of Hahnemann have affected to apply homœopathy to veterinary practice, and have published cases of alleged cures. As in the human subject, these so-called cures are most evidently, however, only natural recoveries,—the diseases, when ending favourably, going through their normal course towards health, totally uninfluenced and unaffected by the infinitesimal doses of drugs exhibited to the animals. (See Dr Routh's Pamphlet, p. 31, etc.) And the patrons of the veterinary homœopathy have unwittingly fallen into a strange and overwhelming mistake in applying to our domestic animals the principles and provings of Hahnemann relative to the human body and human diseases. For they exhibit, or affect to exhibit, to the sick horse, cow, dog, etc., drugs, the medicinal effects or symptoms of which have been ascertained or "proved" upon the healthy human subject. Many medicines, however, produce very diverse effects upon man from what they produce upon the lower animals, and different effects even upon different species of these lower animals. A small dog will take with impunity as much aloes as would kill a strong man; while a man can safely take as much calomel as would poison several dogs. In one of his earlier essays, Hahnemann, himself, points out this well-known fact of medicines not acting alike on man and beasts. "Some (he observes) will say, the administration of drugs to animals by the mouth will furnish some certain results respecting their medicinal action. By no means! How greatly do their bodies differ from ours! A pig can swallow a large quantity of nux vomica without injury, and yet men have been killed with fifteen grains. A dog bore an ounce of the fresh leaves, flowers, and seeds of monkshood; what man would not have died of such a dose? Horses eat it, when dried, without injury. Yew leaves, though so fatal to man, fatten some of our domestic animals. And how can we draw conclusions relative to the action of medicines on man, from their effects on the lower animals, when even among the latter they often vary so much? The stomach of a wolf poisoned with monkshood was found inflamed, but not that of a large and a small cat, poisoned by the same substance. What can we infer from this? Certainly not much, if I may not say—NOTHING."—*Lesser Writings*, p. 299.

As if in anticipation of this veterinary application of homœopathy, there is in the "Lawreæ Appollinares," 1608, the following question put and discussed:—"Whether animals and fools can be cured by same remedies?"—*Wadd's Memorabilia*, p. 141.

We have already had occasion to notice, that the medicinal effects of various important medicines, as iodine, kousso, male-shield-fern, etc., were not, and could not, be ascertained by experiments upon healthy individuals, but only by experiments upon the sick. The general therapeutic effects, however, of some drugs certainly could be, and have been, ascertained from their employment by healthy persons, as emetics, diuretics, purgatives, etc. But in order that such "provings" and experiments on the healthy, as the homœopathsists speak of, could be of any practical value in the homœopathic mode of treatment, it would be necessary also to ascertain, what Hahnemann and his followers have forgotten to ascertain, that the same drug produces the same symptoms, not only in all different individuals to whom it is exhibited in practice, but also in the same individual, equally in the state of health and in different states of diseases. Often we see the same drug, or even the same article of diet, produce opposite effects in health and in illness. The kind of food which was safe and grateful to the patient when well, will frequently, if forced upon the same patient when sick, produce nothing but loathing and nausea, or perhaps indigestion and fever. Opium, which in the state of health, usually produces sleep, will in some diseased states, as delirium tremens, fail, as a general law, to act so in its ordinary doses. Digitalis, squills, spirit of nitrous ether, and other drugs which freely act as diuretics in the state of health, will fail entirely to do so in some states of disease and dropsy. Senna, jalap, sulphate of magnesia, and medicines which act as purgatives upon man in health, often fail to have any such effects when colic and ileus are present; and, on the other hand, would have, in all probability, too great and dangerous a purgative effect in phthisis and some other forms of disease. According to the homœopathic creed, "remedies (observes Dr Bushnan) can only cure those symptoms which are similar to their effects on the healthy body. They cure them by substituting artificial symptoms for the morbid symptoms. Such is the homœopathic doctrine. Again, cases of disease are to be regarded as individualities, that is to say, made up of the particular symptoms which exist at the time of observation. Now, as medicines can only cure such symptoms as are similar to *their* physiological effects, it follows that the effects of the medicine on the individual must be similar to the symptoms of his disease, otherwise no cure can ensue. But medicines produce different effects on different indi-

viduals. Hence, in order to be certain that the medicine we employ is a proper remedy, we must be certain that it will produce such and such effects—similar to those of the disease—in a given case of malady, and on a given individual. This can only be ascertained by trying the medicinal substance on *the* individual himself; and hence it follows, that to practise homœopathy in a logical manner, every one should undergo *two courses* of medicine—the first to ascertain what effects the medicine will produce on the individual in a state of health; the second, in applying these experiments at the sick bed side to cure him.”—P. 153.

But, supposing the drug or drugs used to have been proved in their ordinary doses upon different individuals in states of perfect health, another most grave question arises in connection with infinitesimal doses,—namely, how is it possible to conceive that these same drugs should continue to possess each their own special medicinal qualities and effects when exhibited to patients in doses of a billionth, quintillionth, decillionth, etc., of a grain? Hahnemann’s favourite dose of all homœopathic drugs was, as we have always seen (p. 50), the 30th dilution, or the decillionth of a grain,—that is, a single drop, or fraction of a drop, out of an enormous ocean, consisting of a grain of the drug used, commixed in 14,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 cubic miles of alcohol. Suppose the drug mixed in this ocean to be one grain of quinine, or chamomile, or chalk, or opium, or flint,—how, it was asked by many, is it possible to imagine that the single grain of quinine, or of chamomile, or of opium, or of flint, could impart the special medicinal properties of quinine, or chamomile, or opium, or flint, to every drop of this almost inconceivable ocean of fluid? To get over this plain and simple difficulty Hahnemann found it necessary to invent some explanation. With this view he invented the theory already described (p. 42, 45), of the DYNAMIZATION or POTENTIZING of drugs during their preparation. In other words, he maintained, that in making or preparing the homœopathic drugs in the mode already detailed (p. 40), in consequence of the repeated succussions and triturations to which the drugs were subjected, “a great, hitherto unknown, undreamt of change,” occurred in them, by which the medicinal powers of the drugs were more and more developed, in proportion as they were more and more diluted, shaken, and rubbed :—“Whereby they all (he observes) become penetratingly efficacious and serviceable, even those that, in the crude

state,¹ gave no evidence of the slightest medicinal power on the human body.”² This imaginary development of the medicinal powers of drugs by succussion and trituration, Hahnemann himself held “to be one of the greatest discoveries of the age;” and by these mechanical means alone he fancied that the medicinal action of a grain of a drug may be most strangely increased in power, or (to cite his own words) “potentized almost to infinity.”³ Drugs, though diluted in inconceivable oceans of fluid, could impart to each drop of these oceans a “terrific potency,” provided they were duly succussed and triturated at each attenuation. Hence Hahnemann solemnly warned his disciples against succussing or shaking their medicinal infinitesimal solutions of drugs too much,⁴ lest thus they potentized or dynamized them too strongly for the safety of the patient. And it was under the fear of adding too much to the strength and action of his drugs that, latterly, he advised the diluting bottle to be shaken twice⁵ only at each dilution, instead of receiving ten shakes as he at first recommended.

¹ As flint, chareoal, gold, etc.

² See *Organon*, p. 315, and *Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. vii. p. 444.

³ *Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. vii. p. 444.

⁴ See observations on this matter in a preceding page, p. 42, and foot-note.

⁵ In his *Organon*, p. 315, etc., Hahnemann describes in the following terms the amount of succussions and triturations which, in the preparations of drugs, are thus necessary duly to dynamize or potentize them. When the medicine is a vegetable juice, “two drops (he says) of the fresh vegetable juice, mingled with equal parts of alcohol, are diluted with 99 drops of alcohol, and potentized by means of *two* succussions (or shakes of the containing bottle), whereby the first development of power is formed; and this process is repeated through twenty-nine more phials, each of which is filled three-quarters full with 99 drops of alcohol, and each succeeding phial is to be provided with one drop from the preceding phial—which has been already shaken *twice*—and is in its turn shaken; and in the same manner, at last the 30th development of power (potentized decillionth dilution \bar{X}), which is the one most generally used. All other substances adapted for medicinal use, except sulphur—which has of late years been only employed in the form of a highly diluted (\bar{X}) tincture—as pure or oxydized and sulphuretted metals, and other minerals, petroleum, phosphorus, as also parts and juices of plants that can only be obtained in the dry state, animal substances, neutral salts, etc.,—all these are first to be potentized by trituration for three hours up to the millionfold pulverulent attenuation, and of this one grain is to be dissolved, and brought to the 30th development of power by means of twenty-seven attenuating phials in the same manner as the vegetable juices.”—*Organon*, p. 315. It is perhaps almost superfluous to remark, that when—as here recommended and practised by homœopathic chemists—one drop only is preserved out of the preceding attenuation or phial to medicate the next, the 30th dilution of any drug can be attained by using only thirty phials of fluid; whilst, on the contrary, increasing as the attenuations do, a hundredfold at each dilution, fourteen septillion cubic miles of fluid (see Appendix), would be required to reduce a *WHOLE single grain* to the 30th dilution.

All the more rational of the disciples of Hahnemann have latterly surrendered, either silently or publicly, the romantic doctrine of the dynamization of medicines by mere mechanical triturations and shakings, as too absurd to be maintained. Thus of the homœopathic physicians who have written on the subject—"Fielitz, Schmid, Schneider, Lietzau, Streeker, and others, hold the dynamization theory to be false and hurtful, and consider the homœopathic preparations to be diminutions of the dose merely."¹ "Rau refers the whole secret of dynamization to the well-known fact, that substances become more active by fine subdivision."² Schrön says, that to "potentize," as suggested by the dynamization theory, means to increase the strength of the substance, to "dilute," as is practised in this so-called dynamization, signifies, on the contrary, to diminish its strength, and that virtually "the two notions are irreconcilable,"—while "many facts speak against—none *for* the notion—that the matter (of drugs) undergoes a change of quality by trituration or succussion."³ Rummel was at first an adherent of the dynamization theory, but afterwards saw reason to reject it, correctly "alleging that nothing similar (to potentizing drugs) occurred in nature from rubbing and shaking."⁴ Hartman rejects also Hahnemann's theory of the dynamization of drugs by any rubbing or shaking, and "considers the medicines to be merely diluted," not potentized;⁵ while Veith maintains, that to assert that by our processes of triturations and shakings, "the power of the medicine is transferred to an indifferent substance (as alcohol, or milk-sugar) is to revive the old Persian mystic philosophy of Zoroaster."⁶ "There is (observes an English homœopathist, Dr Black) *no* evidence of any creation of new forces in the processes of trituration and dilution."⁷ "The theory (of dynamization)" remark the editors of the 'Journal of Homœopathy,' "as stated by Hahnemann, *we admit to be untenable*;" "but this theory (they add) is by no means essential to homœopathy, and is rejected by the great majority of his disciples."⁸

Further, in support of the universality of the law, "*similia similibus*," homœopathists appeal as a proof of it, to the results of medical

¹ See Sketch of the Progressive Development of the Homœopathic System, in "British Journal of Homœopathy" for 1849, p. 448.

² Ibid. p. 447.

³ Ibid. p. 449.

⁴ Ibid. p. 449.

⁵ Ibid. p. 449.

⁶ Ibid. p. 450.

⁷ British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. vii. p. 243.

⁸ "Journal of Homœopathy" for July 1852, p. 475-6.

private and hospital practice, as observed when medicines are employed on the homœopathic principle. But in answer to any belief in the truth of these results of so-called medical "*experience*," there is *in limine* one apparently insurmountable objection derivable from their own facts. Some homœopaths, as Schmid and others, use the homœopathic drugs in what is termed their 1st, 2d, or 3d dilutions; others, in their 10th, 20th, or, as Hahnemann, in their 30th dilutions, and, as we have already seen, even higher. But different homœopaths further aver, that in the same disease they get the *same* results, whether the drug is used in its 1st or 3d, or in its 20th or 30th dilutions.¹ And we truly believe they all do "obtain" the same results exactly, whether in the same disease they use very different infinitesimal doses of the *same* drug, or infinitesimal doses of the most opposite and different drugs—because, after all, most un-

¹ For, "if the remedy given be homœopathically selected, it *will* cure in whatever dilution it was administered."—*British Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. v. p. 532. In regard to the attenuation, dilution, dose, or potency of any homœopathic drug, to be administered in the treatment of disease, great discrepancy prevails among homœopathic practitioners. "There is no homœopathic question (observes the editors of the '*British Journal of Homœopathy*,' in which there exists greater discrepancy of opinion among the disciples of Hahnemann. In fact, we may almost say, there are as many opinions as there are practitioners, and each is prepared to prove the superiority of his own by an imposing array of cases."—*Ib.* p. 257. "To some, this variety of opinion and practice appears to be indicative of the untenableness of Hahnemann's dogma; but to us it merely shows, that as long as practitioners remain faithful to the homœopathic principle, they will meet with a large amount of success in practice under almost every variety of dose."—*Ib.* p. 258. "The reason and prejudices of one homœopathist (it is stated in the same *Journal*), lead him to affect the low dilutions, while some plausible hypothesis, or the example of the master, induce another to attach himself to the higher dilutions, and each of these employs, on most occasions, his favourite doses, and sees, in the recovery of his patients under them, the direct influence of his remedies; while, if he ever make use of other dilutions, he is always ready to explain away, in his own mind, the recoveries effected during their use, and to ascribe them to some other cause than the remedy administered."—*Ib.* p. 161. "We are confident (observe the same writers), that all who have employed indifferently the medicines in all dilutions, would be greatly at a loss to determine *which* dilutions are the most efficacious, or to decide which they could best dispense with in some classes of disorders. We speak just now of the scale of dilutions varying from 1 to 30."—*Ib.* p. 161. For other homœopathic opinions to the same effect, see anteriorly, p. 58, Dr Hempel's "*Homœopathic Pharmacopœia*," pp. 39 and 40. In the "*Journal of Homœopathy*" for 1851, Dr Black has a long letter, the "object" of which is (to use his own words) "to prove that the *whole* range or dose, from the crude medicine or mother tincture, up to the highest dilution, is open to, and may be advantageously adopted by, the homœopathic practitioner, and that in doing so, he strictly follows the teaching of Hahnemann."—*Journal*, vol. ix. p. 332.

doubtedly they "obtain" nothing but the natural course and cure of diseases, unaffected by their suppositious and negative doses. There is, however, as we have, indeed, already seen, a difference so vast and tremendous between the same drug when used in its 1st, 2d, or 3d dilution, and when used in its 20th or 30th, as to prove, even in itself, the justness of this deduction, borne out as that deduction is by all other facts relating to homœopathy.

To show this enormous amount of difference in the doses of the same drug as employed in the same diseases by different homœopathists, let us again remark that most homœopaths use their drugs in the form of globules, and let us take these globules to exemplify our remark. The globules used by homœopaths consist, as we have already seen, of two ingredients, viz., sugar (sugar of milk) and a medicinal substance. The smallest, first, or lowest, of the dilutions used by homœopathists, contains 99 grains of sugar to 1 grain of medicine. This mass, filling about an ordinary-sized teaspoon, would yield a very large number of duly medicated globules. Supposing the one grain of medicine added, to be sulphur, these globules of sulphur would, according to the doctrines of Hahnemann, infallibly cure many chronic, cutaneous, and other ailments. But the same dose of sulphur would cure infallibly and certainly the same ailments, according to the experience of the same and of other homœopathists, if attenuated to the 10th or to the 30th degree. To make, however, the 10th dilution or attenuation of the one grain of sulphur, a quantity of sugar in proportion greater than the bulk of Ben-Nevis would be requisite; to make only the 16th attenuation, a quantity of sugar greater than the whole volume of the Earth itself would be necessary; while to form Hahnemann's principal and favourite attenuation or dilution (the 30th), of the single grain of sulphur, millions of millions of millions of globes of sugar, each as large as the Earth, would be requisite. In other words, globules taken from a mass composed of a grain of sulphur, duly triturated and mixed through a mass of sugar equal to quintillions of times the size of the Earth,—or equal to a mass fifty globes the size of the earth,—or equal to a mass the size of Ben-Nevis, have the *same* kind of therapeutical effect and healing property, as globules taken from a mass of a grain of sulphur duly triturated, and mixed with only one teaspoonful of sugar.

When such contradictory results are gravely and solemnly alleged, can we in common reason give any credit to the results at all?

These contradictions, like every other circumstance connected with homœopathy, go merely to afford new evidence of the truth that the very different doses and the very different drugs used in the treatment of the very same diseases by different homœopathists, lead always to precisely the same ultimate results, merely because their infinitesimal doses are so infinitesimal and impotent as not to affect any disease or any case, either for good or for evil; but—as far at least as medicines are concerned—they simply leave all diseases and all cases to their own natural courses and progress.

Or, to pursue our last theme further, let us take another illustration from a homœopathic tincture or *solution*, as that is a form which many homœopathists prefer to the form of globules. For this homœopathic solution let us further select a substance with the preparations, effects, and powers of which, most of mankind and womankind are familiar, such as coffee.

This material, "*cafea cruda*; (raw coffee)" is, according to Jahr, most frequently resorted to as a medicine by homœopathists in the following cases:—in "excessive nervous excitability; excessively painful neuralgia; evil consequences of a chill; convulsions; symptoms preceding small-pox, measles, and scarlatina; purple miliary eruption; sleeplessness from nervous excitement; intermittent fever; evil consequences of unexpected or excessive joy; hardness of hearing; excessively painful odontalgia and angina; pains of childbirth and over violent throes; puerperal peritonitis; cries and agitation of new-born infants; gastric derangements in consequence of the small-pox." ¹ Jahr further states, that the dilutions or potencies, in which coffee or crude coffee is, as a medicine, usually employed by homœopaths, are the 3d, 10th, and 30th; and that the effects of coffee last as long as ten days in some cases of chronic disease.

To form the first division or potency of coffee, one grain of it would require to be duly commixed and diluted with 99 drops of fluid, or with a large teaspoonful of fluid. This constitutes the mother tincture or dilution of coffee and such drugs as are used by Schmid and a few other homœopathists. To form, however, the three attenuations or tinctures of coffee *usually* employed by homœopathists, according to Jahr, the following quantities of fluid would be required. To form the third attenuation, one grain of crude coffee would require to be commixed with 2080 ounces, or

¹ Manual of Homœopathic Medicine, vol. i. p. 185.

13 gallons of fluid. To form the tenth dilution, one grain of coffee would require to be commixed and diffused through an ocean, with a volume of 1400 cubic miles of fluid; or, in other words, with a volume of fluid equal to several times the size of Loch-Lomond. And again, to form the thirtieth dilution of coffee, one grain of it would require to be commixed in a quantity of fluid sufficient to make billions of spherical masses or seas, each large enough to extend from limit to limit of the orbit of Neptune. But according to different homœopathists, a drop taken as a dose out of a teaspoonful of fluid containing a due solution of a grain of coffee, or a drop taken out of the last named ocean of it, containing also a grain, is endowed with similar therapeutic effects. The preparation of coffee would be equally, or nearly equally strong and equally curative, whether the single grain were diffused through a teaspoonful of fluid,—or through thirteen gallons of fluid,—or through a quantity of fluid far larger than Loch-Lomond,—or through a quantity of fluid billions of times larger than the whole planetary system. Indeed, some aver that the last solution, namely, the grain of coffee dissolved and commixed in an ocean billions of times larger than the orbit of Neptune, would be of “terrific potency”¹ (to use their own language), and stronger even than the same grain of coffee triturated and commixed with due succussions (see footnote, p. 264, for their number), only with a teaspoonful of fluid. On this principle, one single grain of coffee ought to make a sufficient dose for many millions of generations, at least for such a small portion of mankind as the coffee-drinking population of Great Britain; and the subject is one which we would recommend homœopathic members of Parliament to bring under the instant and anxious attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and of M. Soyer.

Homœopathists constantly tell us, that, setting aside all preconceived opinions, we ought to give a trial to their system, and we would be convinced by the results of *experience*. The same argument has always been used by all the abettors of every exclusive system of treatment—by hydropathists, hygeists, kinesipaths, etc. etc. Homœopathic experience, however, has obtained the same results even

¹ “This result, so incomprehensible to the man of figures, goes so far that we must set bounds to the succussion progress, in order that the degree of attenuation be not over-balanced by the *increased potency* of the medicine.”—Hahnemann’s *Lesser Writings*, p. 822.

when the principles directing it, or supposed to direct it, were most different—the medicines most different—and the doses most different; because in all cases it obtained the results of the mere natural progress and courses of human maladies as unaffected by drugs—the infinitesimal doses, whether billionths, or decillionths, or centillionths, being doubtlessly negative and nothingless.¹ For certainly very opposite principles have directed and guided both Hahnemann and homœopathists at different periods. “Hahnemann (lately observed one of his followers, Dr Black²) at one time taught that the (infinitesi-

¹ The natural course and natural cure of a disease has, when the patient took homœopathic drugs, or no medicine at all, been sometimes dishonestly vaunted as a wondrous *medicinal* effect, particularly if there had been previously any doubt about the true character and spontaneous curability of the affection. It was thus, for example, in the famous case of Field-Marshal Radetsky,—the pretended homœopathic cure of whom, was received several years ago, with “songs of triumph in the drawing-rooms, as well as in the literary and political journals” of Austria, by the homœopathists of that country. Radetsky had an attack of rheumatic periorbitis, ending in suppuration of the orbital cellular tissue. The accumulation of pus in the orbit pushed forward the ball of the eye; and it was found difficult or impossible (as has often happened in such instances), to determine accurately in diagnosis, whether the protrusion of the eye was the result of carcinomatous disease behind it, or merely of an accumulation of pus behind it. When Professor Jaeger saw the case he was in doubt upon this point, but leaned to the opinion of Professor Flarer, that it was carcinomatous. At last, the true character of the disease was fully decided by the retained pus escaping, and by the eye in consequence speedily receding back to its natural position. Radetsky’s body physician, Dr Hartung, was, however, a homœopathist, and treated the case homœopathically with ten or twelve different homœopathic drugs. This physician, who had an opportunity when the matter escaped, of seeing at once that it was an orbital abscess, and not carcinoma, officially but dishonestly continued to speak of the case as one of carcinoma, and declared the reduction of the so-called carcinomatous eye to be the result of his drugs. He took means to prevent Professor Flarer of Pavia having a sight of the eye after the abscess had burst,—apparently least the falsity of his misrepresentations should have been at once detected;—and, lastly, he sent to the principal German Homœopathic Journal,—the “*Hygiea* of Carlsruh,” a drawing and description of this alleged great homœopathic cure of incurable carcinoma of the eye. But the homœopathic editor of that journal, Dr Griesselich, saw the dishonest character of the case, and refused its insertion. “I received it” (the alleged, but untrue drawing of the diseased eye), wrote Griesselich to Professor Jaeger, “along with a piece of bombast, inviting me to insert it in my journal; but I cannot afford room for things so contrary to sound pathology.” The cure in this, as in many similar instances of orbital process, was effected by nature leading on to the spontaneous evacuation of the retained pus; and to report it, as Dr Hartung then and afterwards anxiously attempted to do, as a cure of incurable carcinoma by his infinitesimal doses, was an act strangely and painfully reflecting upon the honesty of homœopathy. (See a full and interesting account of this case, by Professor Jaeger of Vienna, in the *Monthly Journal of Medical Science* for February 1853.)

² British Journal of Homœopathy for 1851, p. 335.

mal) dose should never be repeated ; but on reading the suggestions of Ægidi, he recommended the repetition of the dose. He afterwards limited the extreme dilution to 30 as the best;¹ but as far as oral tradition goes, it would seem in his later days that he went beyond it. He wrote an essay on coffee, to which he attributed almost all the ills that flesh is heir to ; twenty-three years after this, he wrote his ‘Chronic Diseases,’ and these ills are most ingeniously and with great research attributed to psora,² syphilis, and sycosis. He taught that chronic diseases ought to be treated solely by the homœopathic remedies appropriate to the miasm which caused them, and that they were to be administered internally ; yet in his late years he sanctioned the extirpation of schirrous tumours.” We have already seen (p. 115) that in later life Hahnemann averred, in his usual tone of dogmatic infallibility, that “the treatment of chronic diseases was *invariably* unsuccessful” before his discovery that itch was the cause of seven-eighths of these diseases ; yet he himself asserted as positively, ten or twenty years before that supposed discovery, that he himself “*had* cured the most severe chronic diseases.” If the first of these assertions be true, the other, of course, is not true ; or the reverse. Indeed, in the first six volumes

¹ For adopting the 30th dilution as “the best dose” in all cases, Hahnemann urges as a reason the necessity of having something at least fixed in homœopathy, where nothing truly is fixed ; for if the 30th dilution were used by all, “then,” says he, “our enemies will not be able to reproach us with having NOTHING FIXED—no normal standard.”—*Lesser Writings*, p. 859.

² At a discussion on Psora or Itch at the Hahnemann Medical Society in December 1850, Dr Dudgeon, the learned translator of Hahnemann’s *Organon* and *Lesser Writings*, stated as his belief that Hebra had proved the itch-insect or acarus was “the sole propagator of itch, that if it was removed the disease ceased, and that the insect was generally confined to the hands, wrists, fore-arms, and ankles.” “The eruption (he stated) which appeared in other parts of the body was caused by the scratching of the patient ; and if the insect were removed by any method from the parts in question, the disease ceased.” Dr Dudgeon subsequently remarked to the Society that he “believed that Hahnemann did not admit hereditary diseases, but had stated that such persons as had chronic diseases, *MUST* at one time of their lives have been infected with *genuine itch*.” (*British Journal of Homœopathy* for 1851, pp. 347 and 388.) In previous pages (pp. 24 and 115) we have already seen that Hahnemann had “proved” (as some of his followers term it) that this “thousand-headed monster of disease,” Itch, was the real lurking cause and origin of about seven-eighths of all the chronic affections and maladies to which mankind are liable. See lists of the “innumerable forms” of diseases produced by it at pp. 24 and 25. Hence, according to the view of itch quoted above, all human beings who suffer under any variety of these “innumerable forms” of chronic disease “*must* at one time of *their* lives have been infected with genuine itch !”

of the "Homœopathic Archives," as pointed out by Kopp,¹ all chronic diseases are described and declared by Hahnemann and by his disciples to be easily and permanently cured by ordinary medicines; but in the seventh and following volumes all chronic diseases, except those arising from syphilis or sycosis, are strongly and positively declared by them to be *only* capable of being either easily or permanently cured by antipsoric medicines; for the "infallible" psora theory, and origin of chronic diseases was at that date first brought into vogue.² And though it is an infallible law, we see different homœopaths treating also acute diseases on very opposite principles and by very opposite modes of homœopathic drugging. Thus, for example, Hahnemann held aconite to be of use principally or only in pure inflammatory fever, pneumonia, and one or two other disorders (see foot-note, p. 208); but many homœopathic ladies and physicians use it indiscriminately in acute and even chronic diseases of all kinds, and so commit, according to Mr Everest, "*most extensive mischief*" with this drug. Yet Dr Hempel, a homœopathic practitioner at New York, seems to use aconite as his "chief if not only specific for almost all the thousand ills that flesh is heir to." For, according to Dr Hempel's work ("Domestic Homœopathic Physician,") in almost all affections, "from nettle-rash to consumption, from toothache to apoplexy, aconite is the principal, the best, the infallible remedy."³ Whether Hahnemann or Hempel are right, we must allow homœopathists to decide; but such is the contradictory nature and result of homœopathic experience, and of the practical working of the alleged "infallible" law. There is the same

¹ See his *Denkwürdigkeiten in der Arztlichen Praxis*, Bd. ii.

² In his "Chronic Diseases," vol. i. p. 11, Hahnemann states it as his opinion that all diseases cured by anti-psorics are thus proved *by the effects of treatment* to arise from psora or itch. Then, if this logic be true, dysentery, according to Kopp (p. 422) must arise from syphilis, because it is cured by many with mercurial preparations—and mercury being the Hahnemannian specific for all syphilitic diseases—as antipsorics are for psoric diseases. And yet it would be hard to suppose that every patient, male or female, boy or girl, who had a dysenteric attack was labouring under syphilitic disease. Hahnemann himself sometimes when taking upon him his characteristic asseverations of "infallibility," forgets that his own statements are not in accordance with his own principles. Hahnemann lays it down, that suicidal melancholy is truly psoric, and is only to be cured by antipsoric remedies; yet we have seen him in a previous quotation (p. 64) declaring that the mere smelling of a quintillionth of a remedy which is not antipsoric—namely, gold—will instantly cure a patient labouring under this psoric disease.—See *Kopp's Work*, vol. ii. p. 378.

³ Review of Dr Hempel's work, in *Journal of Homœopathy*, vol. ix. p. 306.

constant discrepancy traceable as to homœopathic *experience* in the treatment of individual diseases. Thus Dr Hausmann maintains that arsenic is the true specific for typhus abdominalis;¹ while Dr Wurmb, another homœopathist, maintains that arsenic is of no use whatever in that disease. According to Bonninghausen (see p. 249), *thuja* is a "certain specific" for small-pox. According to Trinks, etc., it is not of the slightest use in small-pox; and so on with regard to the remedies proposed in measles, dysentery, and in fact every other acute disease. Many different homœopathic specifics, for instance, have, in accordance with the "infallible" law of homœopathy, been recommended in croup, a disease which, in its most common and spasmodic form, is usually speedily enough removed without the necessity of any direct drugging at all. Dr Viettinghoff, a homœopathist, enumerates a long list of upwards of thirty homœopathic remedies² recommended by different homœopathic physicians in croup. But Dr Viettinghoff adds, that, in despite of all these thirty and odd remedies, homœopathy still stands, in his opinion, in want of a secure treatment of croup; and some homœopathists maintain, it would appear, "that the homœopathic principle is not applicable to true membranous croup at all."³ Dr Fleischmann holds that a pneumonia which is not curable by phosphorus alone, is as yet incurable by homœopathy; other homœopathists, however, declare they can cure pneumonia by other homœopathic remedies; and instead, too, of only giving one remedy at one time, they can cure it by alternating five or six times a-day different homœopathic remedies, and thus making a commixture of them. Fortunately, as we have seen in a preceding chapter (p. 105), the infinitesimal doses of phosphorus, and the infinitesimal doses of other commixed homœopathic remedies, allow the disease to pursue quite uninterruptedly its usual natural course towards recovery; this and other acute inflammations⁴ having spontaneously

¹ Oester: Zeitschrift für Homœopathic, vol. ii. p. 118.

² See them all enumerated in "Journal of Homœopathy," vol. ix. p. 462.

³ The Hahnemann Materia Medica, p. 44.

⁴ In a preceding chapter (p. 108) this fact has been sufficiently illustrated with regard to Pneumonia. But it is true of other acute inflammations. "Pericarditis (observes Dr Jackson) is called a very fatal disease; Peritonitis the same; Pleuritis often the same; Gastritis the same; Erysipelas the same; and yet, in truth, Mr Louis, during eight or ten years, passed entirely in hospitals, making daily autopsies, has never, or almost never, seen any one of these by itself fatal in a subject previously healthy; when (adds Dr Jackson) I have heard him, from time to time, announce these laws

this fortunate tendency. Homœopathic *experience*, then, is not certainly such as to tempt any man who actually studies the subject to test the system for himself by trials. Besides, seeing as we have in some of the last paragraphs, that the different schools of homœopathists—those that use the high, and those that use the low dilutions, and who consequently employ means that are certainly not identical, yet get the same identical result—ordinary physicians¹ might

I have doubted; but on reference to my note-book and my memory of individual cases, I have found that my experience coincided with his.”—*Memoirs of Dr James Jackson*, Boston, 1845, p. 168. For examples of the occasional spontaneous cure of the form of intestinal inflammation constituting acute dysentery, see Dr Cumming’s interesting “Notes of a Wanderer,” p. 278; Dr Smith in “Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal,” vol. lvi., p. 160; &c.

¹ I have been privately informed by different practitioners of their being induced, by different circumstances, to try fairly and unprejudicially, in safe and appropriate cases, the effects of homœopathy, and of their experiments always ending in seeing no results whatever,—good, bad, or indifferent—the diseases experimented on always pursuing their own natural courses, without being in any way influenced by the infinitesimal homœopathic doses. In the “British Journal of Homœopathy” for January 1852, p. 159, there is given a quotation from a pamphlet of Dr Stewart’s, accusing me of practising homœopathy in one instance; and I notice it, not for that reason, but to give it as a specimen of the unscrupulous assertions published regarding homœopathic cures and homœopathic practice. The quotation is as follows:—“Towards the close of last winter’s session, when Dr Arneth, of Vienna, was in Edinburgh, he was in the habit of attending Dr Simpson’s lectures. On one occasion, in Dr Arneth’s presence, I recollect that Dr Simpson told his class of a case of vomiting during pregnancy then under his care. He had launched forth in succession all his allopathic appliances—opium, naphtha, prussic acid, etc. (I forget if chloroform was also used), but without relieving the patient. He had either taken Dr Arneth to see it, or had told him about it, and the latter recommended him to try either a quarter or half a grain of ipecacuanha, I do not recollect which. He acted upon this suggestion, and with decided good results.” The case here referred to was one under the care of Dr Myrtle. At the strong recommendation of Dr Arneth, who was with me at the consultation (and whom I did not know at that time to be a practitioner of homœopathy), the patient got half a grain of ipecacuanha; but instead of producing “decided good results,” as Dr Stewart alleges, it made the patient very decidedly worse, and had to be speedily withdrawn, as Dr Myrtle can testify. But mark further the progress of a homœopathic case. In the “British Journal of Homœopathy” for January 1852, it is averred simply, though erroneously, that the use of the alleged homœopathic remedy, ipecacuanha, was followed “with *decided good results*,” nothing more. In the same Journal, however, for July 1852, p. 468, the same case is again referred to; and now it is deliberately and quietly stated, as an actual homœopathic fact, that this was an instance of vomiting in pregnancy “which he (Dr S.) could not cure until he gave the patient very small doses of ipecacuan, *whereupon the vomiting ceased*.” I have merely to repeat, in the name of Dr Myrtle and myself, that, upon the use of the ipecacuan, the vomiting was not “cured;” and that there were even no “good results” from it; but, on the contrary, the very reverse and opposite.

well excuse themselves from making any trials, additional to those the homœopathists have themselves made and published, and the decided evidence of which against, instead of in favour of, homœopathy, we have already fully considered in Chapter XII. Such trials, however, might have been made to a greater extent than they have been. But we are not, either, so entirely without their evidence as homœopathists assert; and conducted, too, under the eye of some of the best medical observers. Dr Marsden, a homœopathist, speaks of Professor Andral of Paris as termed “the Prince of physicians, from his talents, observations, and practical studies.” All gladly acknowledge him to be one of the most conscientious, honest, and able of medical observers. Some years ago M. Andral, calmly, for a time, put homœopathy to the criterion of experience in one of the Parisian hospitals, when its claims were brought before the French Academy of Medicine. “Homœopathia (says Dr Pereira) has been fairly put to the test of experiment by some of the members of the *Academie de Medicine*, and the result was a failure. Andral tried it on 130 or 140 patients, in the presence of the homœopathists themselves, adopting *every* requisite care and precaution, yet in not one instance was he successful.”¹

In describing the results of his experiments to the Academy—

“M. Andral said, he was decidedly opposed to the project of allowing the homœopaths a dispensary: humanity should not be trifled with by the experiments of these people. He had given their system a fair trial; he had treated above 130 or 140 patients homœopathically, *in presence of the Hahnemannians themselves*. M. Guibourt had prepared the medicines; and *every* requisite care and precaution were duly observed: yet in not one instance was he successful. He had tried various experiments on his own person, and several other professional friends had followed his example, in order to ascertain the actual effects of the homœopathic doses; but the results were not as Hahnemann and his disciples described them. He (M. Andral) had taken quinine in the prescribed globules, but had contracted no intermittent fever; he had taken aconite, but without being affected with symptoms of plethora; sulphur he took, to try if he should catch the itch, but he caught nothing; neither, upon swallowing certain globules of arnica, did he feel pains as if he had suffered contusion: and so with various other substances which he and his friends took in obedience to the Hahnemannian precepts. With respect to the attempt to cure disease by this method, he said that in every instance he was obliged to return to allopathy, inasmuch as under the homœopathic treatment the symptoms went on from bad to worse.”²

Notices of some other public and hospital experiments on homœopathy have been published.

¹ *Materia Medica*, vol. i. p. 144.

² From Speech at the Academie de Médecine, reported in “*London Medical Gazette*,” vol. xv. p. 922.

"A German homœopathist (observes Mr Lee), practising in Russia, was invested by the Grand Duke Michael with full powers to prove, if possible, by a comparison of facts, the advantages of homœopathic measures over the ordinary modes of treatment; and a certain number of patients in the wards of a military hospital were intrusted to his care. At the expiration of two months, however, he was not permitted to proceed further. For in comparing results, it was seen that within this period, out of 457 patients treated by the ordinary means, 364, or three-fourths, were cured, and none died; whereas by the homœopathic method, tried on 128 patients, one half were cured, and five had died."—*Pamphlet on Homœopathy*, p. 9.

The Russian Government, it is further stated by Dr Lee, tried in two hospitals the comparative treatment of a number of patients with homœopathic globules, and a number of other patients with no drugs of any kind; and the results were found very similar in both instances.

A commission appointed by royal order at Naples to superintend the treatment of a number of hospital patients by homœopathy, reported as the result of their observations—"1st. That the homœopathic treatment produced no effect; and 2d. That it had the serious inconvenience, in several of the patients, of preventing the employment of remedies by which they might be cured."¹

I have in my possession a letter from an eminent London physician, one whom, I believe, the homœopathists themselves would acknowledge to be a most accurate observer and reasoner, and a man of the most disinterested candour. He for some time watched and studied, in the London Homœopathic Hospital² itself, the evidence to be gained for or against homœopathy, in the results of the treatment of the sick under the Hahnemannian doctors attached to that institution, and his conclusion, he writes me, is this—"Every thing in it, and out of it, fully confirms the view, that, as to *practice*, homœopathy is truly a nonentity; it is *literally*, as your author Hue says (see p. 86), the *swallowing of* NAMES only." And most truly, when patients swallow only the decillionths, octillionths, quintillionths, trillionths, etc., of a grain of drugs, they, like the ignorant self-duped patients of the Tartar physicians, are, in reality, content with swallow-

¹ Edwin Lee on Homœopathy, p. 11, where some details of the Naples experiments are given.

² There are two small homœopathic, and I believe, opposition hospitals in London. The worthless character of the medical observations made in them was lately denounced in the following terms by one of their own organs, the "Homœopathic Times:"—"We have in London two homœopathic hospitals; one circumscribing its usefulness, the other nullifying its own labours; the one crushing its statistics, the other rendering its statistics useless, flowing from an adulterated source." Quoted in the *Medical Times*, for July 3, 1852, p. 24.

ing the NAMES of their drugs only, for such pretended doses are assuredly nothing more.

Many a lady Hahnemannian practitioner has, however, I have no doubt, her own infallible homœopathic experience to adduce in contradiction to that of these physicians. But let such listen for a moment to what homœopathic *medical* practitioners themselves think of this so-called homœopathic experience. When, some time ago, alluding to amateur Hahnemannian doctors, female and male, Dr Madden of Brighton, a distinguished homœopathic physician, thus spoke of *their* credulity and *their* cures:—"Their credulity! oh! the wonders which they heard of daily, as affected by amateur practitioners (of homœopathy); and what *were* these in the vast majority of cases? SIMPLY NATURAL RECOVERIES, IN WHICH THE ALL-POTENT GLOBULES TOOK NO SHARE. Such boasting (observed Dr Madden) did infinite injury; it might for a time convince the public, but the profession saw through the flimsy triumphs, and at once concluded that all their cures belonged to the same class."¹

And we have—as I conscientiously believe—the most certain, and sure, and ample reasons for extending Dr Madden's observation, in its fullest force and significance ("boasting" and "credulity" included), from the whole sisterhood of homœopathic *amateur* practitioners, to their brethren, the homœopathic *medical* practitioners. Indeed, taking a similar view of the question, a late amateur homœopathic writer, denounces as in practice altogether untrustworthy, all converted homœopathic medical practitioners, like Dr Madden. "It is (observes Mr Everest), if the truth must be told, a national calamity, and nothing else, when a doctor is converted. Armed with his diploma, he plunges *in medias res*, gives pilules, drops, aconite water; mistakes aggravations of the natural disorder, and plays almost as many pranks with the little single medicines as he did with the compound ones."² And Mr Everest (the personal friend and disciple of Hahnemann) upbraids most modern homœopathic medical practitioners, as knowing indeed little or nothing of the proper practice of homœopathy, or the principles of Hahnemann,

¹ See Speech of Dr Madden, after a dinner of the British Homœopathic Society, (*in vino veritas*), reported in vol. v. p. 545 of the "British Journal of Homœopathy,"—Dr Russell of Edinburgh, in the chair.

Sermon, P. 75.

and as consequently committing “hideous” and “fatal” mistakes in the practical application of the system of Hahnemann. For “modern homœopathy (observes this Reverend author) rushes through all the Sage’s precautions, like a mad bull through a field of flowers.”—(P. 17.)

At the same time, there remains behind a far more serious and solemn view of this discreditable medical charlatanry. For, in relation to the question of homœopathy and infinitesimal doses, as actually applied in *practice*, no one conversant with disease can shut his eyes to the dangers of the system, in the way of omission, if not of commission,—dangers which were lately stated in the following forcible terms by Dr Williams, a gentleman acknowledged on all hands to be standing in the foremost rank of the London physicians of the present day:—“You see (says Dr Williams) all sorts of quackery, with homœopathy foremost, rampant through the land, deluding, by its unaccountable infatuations, the powerful, the learned, the rich, and, worse than all, the poor, in multitudes; and not only are riches placed at the command of the instruments of these fallacies, but, what are far more precious, and this is far more terrible to contemplate,—the lives of our fellow-creatures. In fact, there is at this moment throughout this country an awful system of trafficking or gambling with the issues of life and death, a perilous tampering with the elements of mortality; nay, a jeopardising, not of the body only, but even of the soul. For who can say, where victims are hurried out of the world by a delusion, and for want of proper treatment, who can say that some of such might not have been saved alive, and given time for repentance as well as recovery? It is altogether an awful consideration; and I quite shudder when I look back at the number of melancholy cases which have come to my knowledge, where, at the eleventh hour, the regular practitioner has been called in when it was too late; when the precious time, in which medicine might have availed, had been wasted with homœopathy; and we could only shake our heads, and lift up our hands, and exclaim, ‘Alas! what folly!’ and I fear we might add, ‘What knavery too!’”¹

¹ From “Report of the Speeches on Irregular Practice,” at the last Meeting of the Provincial Medical Association, p. 19.

A P P E N D I X.

COMPUTATIONS REGARDING THE ACTUAL AMOUNT OF THE INFINITESIMAL DOSES OR DILUTIONS USED IN HOMŒO- PATHY; TABLES OF THE DOSES OR DILUTIONS.

AT various parts in the preceding chapters I have referred to the supposed amount that is contained in the infinitesimal doses of the drugs used by homœopathic practitioners. In the present Appendix let me take an opportunity of stating the principles upon which these computations have been made.

There are four series of “doses,” “potencies,” “preparations,” “attenuations,” “divisions,” “degrees of division,” “dynamizations” or “dilutions” (for these terms are used synonymously), in use among homœopathic practitioners : namely,—1. The Lower ; 2. The Middle ; 3. The Higher ; and 4. The Highest potencies. Dr Hempel, in his late work on the homœopathic materia medica,¹ gives the following definitions of these four potencies or attenuations :—

1. “The LOWER potencies or preparations range from the original forms of drugs (tinctures, or primitive chemical, vegetable, mineral, or metallic substances) up to the 6th attenuation.”

2. “The MIDDLE potencies (range) from the 6th to the 30th attenuation.”

3. “The HIGHER potencies from the 30th to the 200th.”

¹ “New Homœopathic Pharmacopœia and Posology.” London, 1850, p. 29.

4. "The HIGHEST potencies from the 200th to any attenuation above that number."

"All these different potencies are used," says Dr Hempel, "by their respective adherents, and are proclaimed by them as *the best and most useful*; or rather, only useful preparations" (p. 39.)

Without attempting to obtain (what seems really unattainable) some computatory idea of the extent to which a grain or a drop of any drug is attenuated or diluted, in order to form one of these "HIGH potencies,"¹ let us simply content ourselves with tracing the

¹ In the preceding pages we have found various homœopathic physicians recommending and employing potencies as high as 100, 200, 1000, 2000, etc. We have before seen (p. 56) that in Germany (in 1850) there were a "LARGE NUMBER of practitioners staunch adherents to the HIGH potencies;" and that they are used also by homœopaths in this country (see pp. 57, 58; and foot-note, p. 143). Mr Walker, Mr Headland, and the English homœopathic chemists and practitioners, have themselves duly prepared and keep for use these higher dilutions. I have already stated (p. 143) that one of the most fashionable and successful homœopathic physicians in London frequently prescribes his medicines in their 200th dilution. The chemist, my informant, has himself prepared and keeps in his shop a 40,000th dilution or attenuation of arsenic. In the "Journal of Homœopathy" for July 1852, Dr Acworth (an English homœopentlist), states—"I have obtained results from the 200th attenuation of arsenic and digitalis, which I could not obtain from the 30th or the 3d" (p. 438.) These attenuations were prepared by Mr Headland, the London chemist. In the "Homœopathic Journal" for October 1852, there is reported a discussion, at the last Homœopathic Congress, on the subject of the proper doses or potencies to be used. In relation to this matter, Dr Beilby of Glasgow, at the discussion in question, spoke of having used successfully the 800th dilution of hemlock; Dr Moore mentioned having employed beneficially the 100th dilution of phosphorus; Dr Black, though allowing "that high dilutions did cure and cure well," yet urged the employment of the lower dilutions, both and as most easily made, and in order to remove "the prejudices their allopathic brethren had against them on account of the infinitesimal doses." Dr Rutherford Russell mentioned that, "with regard to his own experience in this matter, he certainly had seen very remarkable effects occasionally from high dilutions." "Homœopaths (Dr Drysdale observed) certainly knew that a 15th, a 30th, or even a *higher* dilution acted very well; in one or two cases, indeed, more remarkably than low dilutions, but his preference was certainly still in favour of low dilutions, although, perhaps, a more brilliant and signal success might be obtained from the higher." Dr Dudgeon stated that "he did not think that the advocates of the higher dilutions had obtained any better success than what the advocates of the lower could show; he had a very decided opinion in favour of the lower dilutions in most cases, though there were some in which the higher numbers seemed to cure better." The chairman of the meeting, Professor Henderson, thought "there was as yet a total want of evidence of high dilutions being more potent than the low." "As to the great difference of opinion respecting the doses for different cases, I think (Dr Henderson added) the one fact is VERY ORATIFYING that from 30 downwards we have *ample* evidence that the medicines do produce curative effects. The only subject of enquiry is what point is best. They all do produce an effect, but the difficulty arises from the very fact that they all do produce an

degree to which a grain or a drop of a drug requires to be attenuated, in order to form only the “lower” or “middle” potencies of homœopathic practitioners;—that is to say, the attenuations, dilutions, or potencies, which range from 1 to 30.

Several homœopathic works give the following, as their standard table, to show the amount of a grain or drop (these two quantities or terms being usually regarded as synonymous) of any drug, which exists in the different “middle” and “lower” dilutions of homœopathy :—

Table of Quantity of any Drug in different Attenuations, or Potencies, from the 1st to the 30th.

First,	=	One Hundredth of a Drop or Grain.
Second,	=	One Ten-thousandth do.
Third,	=	One Millionth do.
Sixth,	=	One Billionth do.
Ninth,	=	One Trillionth, do.
Twelfth,	=	One Quadrillionth do.
Fifteenth,	=	One Quintillionth do.
Eighteenth,	=	One Sextillionth do.
Twenty-first,	=	One Septillionth do.
Twenty-fourth,	=	One Octillionth do.
Twenty-seventh,	=	One Nonillionth do.
Thirtieth,	=	One Decillionth do.

“The fraction,” says Hempel, p. 36, “of the primitive drop in each attenuation can easily be ascertained, since all the denominators of these fractions increase as the powers of 100. In the first attenuation, each drop contains the 100th part of the primitive drop; in the second, the 10,000th; in the third, the 1,000,000th part; etc.: so that, in the 30th, each drop will contain the 100³⁰th or 1,000,000¹⁰th part of the primitive drop;” or in other words, its 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000th part. Some authorities, however, as Dr Forbes, calculate a decillionth as still greater,—reckoning it as a unit followed by 72 ciphers, instead of a unit followed only by 60 ciphers, as I have always (to the advantage of the homœopathists) calculated it in the preceding chapters and in the present appendix. “The

effect. But the fact that *all dilutions, from 30 downwards, will produce an effect, seems to me established by the experience of ALL.*”—*British Journal of Homœopathy* for October 1852, p. 694.

billionth attenuation" (says Dr Hempel of America), "in our language, would contain three times three ciphers; whereas, in the German, it is meant to contain four times three ciphers." In the preceding chapters, I have, in accordance with the usual practice of English arithmeticians, always calculated a billion as a unity followed by 12 ciphers. The smaller numbers, however, yield sufficiently satisfactory and startling results, without having recourse to the higher, and perhaps more correct, formulæ.

At pages 64, 65, I have cited Hahnemann averring that, if a desponding and suicidal patient will swallow, or rather smell merely, a quintillionth of a grain of gold, he will be restored, within an hour, to peace of mind and love of life; and I further stated, that to reduce, according to Hahnemann's own rules, one single grain of gold (or, of course, a single grain of any other homœopathic drug) down to quintillionths,—or, in other words, to the 15th attenuation or potency,—the single grain of the medicine would require to be duly mixed through a mass of sugar proportionally equal to at least FIFTY globes or worlds of the size of the entire EARTH. The quantity of sugar actually necessary to reduce one whole grain to quintillionths, would be a mass equal to SIXTY-ONE globes the size of the Earth. To prove this, let me subjoin one or two explanatory remarks and the formula for this computation.¹

The subjoined arithmetical formula shows, first, the result when we divide a quintillion of grains (the number contained in the first line in the formula below) by 240 (see second line), or the average number of grains of sugar, or sugar of milk, found by experiment to be contained in a cubic inch. Secondly, the quotient shows the number of cubic inches (as stated in third line) contained in a quintillion of grains of sugar; and this number, when again divided by the number of cubic inches in a cubic mile (stated in fourth line), yields the number of cubic miles of sugar contained in a quintillion grains of it. Lastly, when we divide this number of cubic miles (as given in fifth line) by the number of cubic miles contained in the mass of the Earth (as given in sixth line), we obtain the number of masses of sugar equal to the dimensions of the Earth required to make a quintillion of grains of sugar. Thus,—

¹ As stated in the Preface, these and the following computations have been kindly revised for me and authenticated by several of our most distinguished Professors of Mathematics.

$$\frac{1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000}{240} \text{ cubic inches.}$$

$$= \frac{4,166,667,000,000,000,000,000,000,000}{254,358,061,056,000} \text{ cubic miles.}$$

$$= \frac{16,381,000,000,000}{263,900,000,000} = 61 \text{ globes of the bulk of the Earth.}$$

A quintillion of grains is expressed arithmetically by unity followed by thirty ciphers, as in the first line. A quintillion divided by 240, the number of grains contained in a cubic inch of sugar, gives 4167 quadrillion cubic inches of sugar in the quintillion of grains. These 4167 quadrillion cubic inches divided by the number of cubic inches in a cubic mile (viz., 254,358,061,056,000), or, two hundred and fifty-four billions, three hundred and fifty-eight thousand and sixty-one millions, and fifty-six thousand,—gives $16\frac{2}{5}$ billions of cubic inches as the size of a mass of sugar containing a quintillion grains of sugar. This again, divided by 263,900,000,000 (or two hundred and sixty-three thousand nine hundred millions), the number of cubic miles in the globe of the earth, gives as the result SIXTY-ONE GLOBES OF SUGAR OF THE DIMENSIONS OF THE EARTH AS CONTAINED IN A QUINTILLION OF GRAINS OF SUGAR. The quantity of sugar then required for the reduction of one single grain of gold, or oyster-shell, or sulphur, or any other homœopathic drug, to the fifteenth trituration or potency, is a mass equal to sixty-two times the size of the Earth. And further, a portion out of this enormous mass, equal to a small pill or globule, is, according to the tenets of homœopathy, a proper dose of the drug employed.

But Hahnemann came latterly to use as his constant and standard potency for gold, and all other drugs, a higher potency, viz., the thirtieth. In his last work, “he of course (observes Dr Dudgeon) orders the decillionth or thirtieth dilution to be given in every case.” To reduce, however, a grain of gold or any other drug or supposed drug to this decillionth or thirtieth dilution, would require the single grain of the medicine to be commixed through a mass of sugar immensely greater than for the quintillionth or fifteenth dilution. The mass can easily be ascertained by a simple rule of proportion, for if a quintillion grains or

$$1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000$$

are equal to 61 masses of sugar of the size of the earth, then a decillion of grains or

[illegible]

61,000,000.000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000

globes of sugar each of the dimensions of our planet. In other words, the proportion of any drug in the thirtieth dilution or decillionth globules of the homœopaths is to the sugar contained in the globules as one grain is to SIXTY-ONE QUINTILLIONS OF SPHERES OF SUGAR, EACH OF THESE 61,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 SPHERES OF SUGAR BEING OF THE DIMENSIONS OF THE EARTH.

The preceding calculations are founded on the idea that *sugar* is the medium used for attenuation in making the different potencies, one grain of the drug with 99 grains of sugar forming the first attenuation; one grain of the drug with 9999 forming the second attenuation; and so on. But generally *alcohol*, or alcohol and water, are employed to form the attenuations or dilutions. With fluid substances it is employed as the medium of attenuation or dilution from the first; and with solid substances after the third attenuation. (See the details already given in p. 40, etc.) The GLOBULES (when sugar-globules and not tinctures are used) are medicated by being merely touched by the moistened stopper of the phial which contains the proper alcoholic potency in its proper attenuation, as the 10th, 20th, or 30th. (See p. 41). The following Table is constructed on the form of the preceding common table of homœopathic attenuations, and is drawn up for the purpose of showing the quantity of alcohol or fluid required to dilute or reduce *one single grain* or *drop* of any medicine down to the principal attenuations or potencies, as the 1st, 3d, 15th, etc. The computations are made on the idea that (as is usually calculated by writers on physics) the first 60 drops of fluid are equal at least to a drachm; 480 drops are equal to an ounce; 160 ounces equal to a gallon; one gallon equal to 277 cubic inches; and 254,000,000,000,000 cubic inches equal to a cubic mile. The diameter of the orbit of Neptune (see 24th and 30th attenuations) is reckoned at 5,700,000,000 miles; and the distance of the nearest fixed star as 20,000,000,000,000 miles.

Table showing the quantity of alcohol or fluid required to dissolve one single grain or drop of a homœopathic drug (as sulphur, aconite, etc.) down into the following homœopathic attenuations or dilutions.

No. of Attenuation, Dilution, or Potency.	Relative Quantity of the Drug, and of the quantity of Alcohol in which it is dissolved in each Attenuation.
--	--

1st Attenuation.—One grain, or drop, in one and a-half teaspoonfuls of alcohol.

2d Attenuation.—One grain, in twenty-one fluid ounces of alcohol.

3d Attenuation.—One grain, in two thousand and eighty ounces; or in one hundred and four pints of alcohol.

6th Attenuation.—One grain, in thirteen million gallons; or in two hundred and six thousand hogsheads; or in fifty-one thousand tuns of alcohol.

9th Attenuation.—One grain, in a lake of alcohol with a volume of about fourteen cubic miles; or in a lake of fifty fathoms in depth, and presenting two hundred and fifty miles of square surface.

12th Attenuation.—One grain, in a sea containing about fourteen million cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity of fluid equal to a sea six times the size of the Mediterranean Sea.

15th Attenuation.—One grain, in an ocean of fourteen billion cubic miles of alcohol; or in an ocean about forty-six thousand times greater than the whole waters contained in all the oceans of the Earth.

24th Attenuation.—One grain, in an ocean of fourteen quintillion cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity sufficient to make one hundred and forty masses, each filling a sphere extending from limit to limit of the orbit of the planet Neptune.

30th Attenuation.—One grain, in an ocean of fourteen septillion cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity sufficient to make one hundred and forty billion spherical masses extending from limit to limit of Neptune's orbit; or in a quantity equal to many hundred spheres each with a semi-diameter or radius extending from the Earth to the nearest fixed Star.

This thirtieth, or last, of these attenuations or dilutions is, according to Hahnemann, the most appropriate dose of every drug in every disease. For we have already found him strongly and solemnly declaring (see p. 50), that "it holds good and will continue to hold good as a homœopathic therapeutic maxim, not to be refuted by any experience in the world, that THE BEST DOSE of the properly selected remedy is ALWAYS the very smallest one in one of the high dynamizations, X (or the 30th dilution,) as well for chronic as for acute diseases." Now, this 30th dilution, which Hahnemann thus asserts as indubitably "*the best dose*" of all drugs for chronic or acute diseases, consists of a decillionth of a grain of the drug used; or, in other words, it consists of a MINUTE GLOBULE OF SUGAR, MOISTENED BY BEING SIMPLY DIPT IN A DROP OUT OF AN OCEAN OF FLUID ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY BILLIONS (OR 140,000,000,000,000) TIMES AS LARGE AS OUR WHOLE PLANETARY SYSTEM, AND WHICH ENORMOUS OCEAN HAS BEEN MEDICATED FOR THE PURPOSES OF HOMŒOPATHY, BY HAVING DISSOLVED AND MIXED THROUGH IT ONE SINGLE GRAIN OF THE APPROPRIATE DRUG.

Surely common sense and common sanity both dictate to the human mind that it is utterly impossible that any such dose, from any such an inconceivable ocean, medicated by a *single grain* of any drug dissolved and mixed in it, can have any possible medicinal effect upon the human body, either in a state of health or in a state of disease; and,—looking at these and the numerous and diversified facts, CONFIRMATORY IN ALL RESPECTS OF THE SAME VIEW, which have been already stated in the preceding pages,—we cannot but conclude with a writer whom the homœopathists themselves regard as the mildest and fairest among their opponents, namely, Dr Forbes, that in rejecting homœopathy, "we are discarding what is AT ONCE FALSE AND BAD—USELESS TO THE SUFFERER—AND DEGRADING TO THE PHYSICIAN."

INDEX.

- ABERCROMBIE, Dr, on universality of gravitation, 245.
- Acarus scabiei, the immediate cause of itch, 25, 271.
- Aconite misused by homœopathists, 208.
- contradictory opinions of its homœopathic utility, 272.
- Aggravations, medicinal, by homœopathic drugs, 205, 212.
- Ague, its cure by cinchona bark, 242.
- incurable by infinitesimal doses of it, 248.
- not produced by quinine, 243.
- Alcohol, its alleged exemption from homœopathic law, 46.
- Allopathic drugs and doses, surreptitious use of, by homœopaths, 33, 188.
- Dr Taylor on, 189.
- Allopathy and homœopathy, possible conjunction of, in practice, denounced by Hahnemann, Black, etc., 19, 195.
- Mr Brodribb on this conjunction, 194.
- Dr Henderson's adherence to, 19.
- Alphonso, Prince, the expiatory victim for the physical redemption of mankind, 22.
- Alum, duration of symptoms of, 259.
- Amateur homœopathists, their alleged cures, 277; Dr Madden on, 277.
- Andral, M., his trial of homœopathy, 275.
- Anthelmintics, action of, not discoverable on healthy body, 181.
- Apostle of homœopathy, his religious ideas of it, 22, 23.
- Assertious, homœopathic, unscrupulous character of, 89, 274, etc.
- Association for the protection of homœopathic students and practitioners, 7.
- Asthma, action of ipecacuanha on, 217.
- Attenuations, quantity of drug in them, 52, 61, 281; calculations regarding, 283.
- Auxiliaries, employment of, in homœopathy, 193.
- Dr Madden on, 196.
- Bacon, Lord, on witches, 146; his belief in weapon-salves, 36.
- Beilby, Dr, on high dilutions, 280; medicinal aggravations, 211.
- Belladonna, as a supposed prophylactic against scarlet fever, refuted, 230; various dissimilar diseases cured by, 230; delusions produced by, 76, 77.
- Berkley, Bishop, on tar-water as an universal remedy, 80, 238.
- Billionths, time required to swallow one grain in billionths, 13.
- Bönnighausen, petition to suppress vaccination, 249.
- Bosquet, mutual influence of small-pox and cow-pox, 158.
- Bosquillon versus Hahnemann, 160.
- Box, history of a homœopathic, 15; swallowing of whole contents of one, 224; analogous contents of witch-boxes, 142-3.
- Bread-pills, action of, under mental impressions, 257.
- Breda, medicinal wonders at, from swallowing nothing, 83, 84.
- Bug-bites cured by swallowing doses of bugs, 28.
- Bushnan, Dr, pecuniary suggestions as to cinchona, 248.
- Calculations of the doses or attenuations, 283.
- Cannizzaro, Duke di, death of, from concentrated nux vomica, 33.
- Carbonate of lime or chalk, symptoms of, 73; list of dissimilar diseases cured by, 231.
- Champooing, a universal cure, 79, 201, 204.
- Charcoal, number and duration of symptoms of, 259.
- Charlatanry often patronised by rank, 36; and specially by clergymen, 7, 145.
- Cholera treated by internal doses of cholera injections, 29.
- Chomel, Professor, his cases of ague cured by rest, diet, etc., 247.
- Chronic diseases, mostly the result of genuine itch or coffee, 24, 271.
- Cinchona bark, cure of ague by, 242.
- the origin of homœopathy, 241; Dr R. Russell on, 242; Rev. Mr Everest on, 242.
- cures, but does not cause ague, 243.
- Hahnemann's first experiment with, nullified, 258.
- pecuniary suggestions regarding, 248.
- Clergy, the, impossible cures attested by, 81, 203.
- promoters of quackery, 37, 145.
- Coffee, numerous diseases caused by, 25,

- 271; cured by, 268; amount of fluid required to dilute, 269; its terrific potency in infinitesimal doses, 269.
- Colchicum, action of, in gout, 216.
- Colleges and examining boards, resolutions of, 1; preface, viii.
- Colocynth, religious symptoms produced by, 30; duration of symptoms of, 259.
- Coloured water, symptoms and cures from, 84.
- Coma, homœopathic cure by opium, 68.
- Common sense, standard of, in medicine, 11, 236.
- Compound drugs or mixtures denounced by Hahnemann, yet many of his globules true commixtures, 47.
- Confessions of a homœopathist, extract from, 33.
- Conversion, spiritual, homœopathy essential to, 26; obstructed by itch, 28.
- Cornack, Dr, on dishonesty of homœopathic practitioners, 192; Rev. Mr Everest's letter to, 7, 242, etc.
- Cow-pox, its relations to small-pox, 152-158, 249; not annihilated by small-pox, 152.
- Credulity, medical, its various forms, 139; the same not extended to quackeries in law, politics, agriculture, etc., 199; medical credulity of England, 238.
- Croup, homœopathy not applicable to, 273.
- Cures, instance of, by mistaken infinitesimals, 86; cures vaunted, failures concealed, 91.
- Cuttle-fish ink, number of symptoms of, 259.
- Davy, Sir Humphrey, his cure of paralysis, 85.
- Decillionth doses, the best dose of Hahnemann, 39, 271; calculations as to its actual amount, 59, 60, 284; fluid required to dilute one grain into decillion doses, 285; length of a row of decillion globules, 53, 54.
- Delusions, list of, produced by homœopathic medicines, 76.
- Diet, articles of forbidden, 83; the globules as a safe form of, 224; remedial efficacy of, 82; idiosyncracies in, 222.
- Dilutions, scale of, 40, 281, 285.
- high, their nature and extent, 56, 58, 143, 279, 280; advocates of these, 55-8, etc.; amount of fluid required for the lower and middle dilutions, 285; how formed, 42; same therapeutic effect alleged from all dilutions, 59, 266, 269.
- Disciples, number of, no test of truth of any system, 144.
- Diseases, aggravated by large doses, 39; best dose for all, 50, 286; composition of, 173; cure of dissimilar, by same drug, 228; law of non-recurrent, 250; nature's cure of, by similars, 151; their frequent spontaneous cure, 82, 114, 108, 197, 273; change their types at different times, 104.
- Dose, the very smallest, the best, 39; a billionth, 12; a decillionth, 12, 51, etc.; repetition of, 225; effects differ with size of, 228.
- Doses, vast differences between different dilutions, 59, 60, 268; commixture of, hazardous, 228.
- Drug, number of symptoms referred to each, 259; quantity of, in attenuations, 281.
- Drugs, homœopathic, actions of, different in different individuals, 262; action of infinitesimals an imaginary effect, 258; cure of dissimilar diseases by same drug, 228; dilutions of, not essential, 266; dynamization of, 45, 263; method of ditto, 264; theory of ditto surrendered by later homœopathists, 265; moral and religious symptoms from same, 30; physical proofs of efficacy of, 119; physical quantity set aside in, 143; quantity of, in attenuations, 281; relations of, to diseases, 241; spiritual power of, 23.
- Dynamization of drugs, 45, 263; how affected mechanically, 46; doctrine of, surrendered by later homœopathists, 265.
- Everest, Rev. Mr, interpretation of Matt. x. 7, 8, 25; opinion of, regarding homœopathic converts, 277; on origin of homœopathy, 242; sermon of, how far homologated by homœopathists, 28; itch-cure, 24; list of crimes, sins, etc., resulting from leprosy or itch, 25.
- Evidence, value of, in medicine, 81.
- Exceptions, homœopathy founded on, 244, 253.
- Experience, as a test of homœopathy, 78, 269, 276; as a test of Magnetoscope, 129; contradictions of homœopathic, 270-3, with annulets, 197; fallacies in, credulity regarding, 81.
- Experiments, public, to test homœopathy, 275.
- Faith, homœopathic profession of, 5.
- as a curative means, 83; homœopathic ease of it, 86.
- Fleischmann, Dr, on curability of Pneumonia, 273; hospital returns of analysed, 91, etc.
- Flint or Silicea, moral symptoms from it 48, 49.
- Fluid, amount of, required for the dilutions, 55, 285.
- Forehead, blow on, cured by pressure with the thumb, 213.
- Frost-bite, cured by snow frictions, not homœopathically, 255; explanation of cure of, 256.
- Germany, state of homœopathy in, 31, 34, 35, Dr Oskar Prieger on ditto, 35.
- Globules or pills, as articles of diet, 224; mode of making them, 41, 267; cost of, 14; length of a row of a decillion, 54; made by infection, 44; not necessarily medicated, 15; contain potentized silicea, from the mortars used, 48; quantity of sugar required to make, 267.
- Goitre, burnt sponge, a remedy for, 253; cure of, by iodine, 68, 252; Sir Jno. Herschell on ditto, 252; not produced by iodine, 63, 253; palo-coto or Goitre stick a remedy for, 253.

- Goitre stick, use of, in South America, 253.
 Gold administered by olfaction in suicidal mania, 64; error in giving it for such, 272; medicinal in infinitesimal doses, 45.
 Gout, action of colchicum upon, 216.
 Greatrake's cures attested by Boyle, Flammstead, etc., 36, 84.
 Gray, Dr Zachary, on witchcraft, 144.
 Gravitation, doctrine of similia similibus compared to, 245.
 Gross, Dr, his praise of high dilutions, 59; allows them only to be smelled, 228.
 Hahnemann, his antecedents, 3; considered a messenger from heaven, 21; the new evangelist, 21; inspiration of, 21; contradictions of, 271, 272; his denunciation of old school, 3, 89, 114; of any mixed practice, 19; his first experiment in homœopathy, 258; mode of practice of, 14; Schubert's account of his actual belief, 17, 88; his misrepresentations, 10; of Willan, 154; of Bosquillon, 160; his boasting, 89; his changeableness of opinion, 270.
 Hahnemann Publishing Society, its members, etc., 76.
 Hall, Dr Marshall, on medical quackery, 37, 201.
 Harmony, want of, on homœopathy among homœopaths, 249, 272, etc.
 Hartung, Dr, his case of Field-Marshall Radetsky, 270.
 Haygarth, Dr, his experiments with metallic tractors, 85.
 Hempel, Dr, on scale of dilutions, etc., 279.
 Henderson, Professor, advocacy of mixed practice, 19; curative effects of infinitesimals from 30th dilution downwards, 280.
 Herpes, alleged cure of, by measles, 165.
 Herschell, Sir John, illustrations from, 241; on quinine, 242; on cure of Goitre by iodine, 252; on sea-scurvy, 251; on vaccination, 249.
 High dilutions, opinions upon, 280; supporters of their efficacy, 55, 58, etc.
 Hohenloe, Prince, his cures, 84.
 Homœopathic mode of cure, rationale of, 212.
 Homœopathic petition to University of Edinburgh, 7.
 Homœopathic practitioners, dishonesty of some, 192, 259, 32, 90; supererogatory of others, 259; association for protection of, 7; form of licence to, 21; oath administered to, 23; general standard of intelligence among, 32.
 Homœopathic prohibitions, 83.
 Homœopathic school for young ladies, 29.
 Homœopathy, aims of, 3, 173; its exclusiveness, 4; a form of religion, 22; a sweeping reformation, 3; an interesting experiment, 187; applied to veterinary practice, 261; based on symptomatology, 174; compared with witchcraft, 139; course of nature inverted in, 143; employment of auxiliaries in practising it, 193; its alleged force - shadowing in Scripture, 21; founded on exceptions, 244, 253; has the character of infinity, 23; infinitesimal doses, an essential element in, 38, 39, 234; origin of, in mind of Hahnemann, 241, 245; physical laws set aside in, 143; requisite for spiritual conversion, 26; spiritual tendencies of, 23; public trial of, by M. Andral, 275, 258; do. in Russia and Naples, 276.
 Hooping-cough prevented by measles, 159.
 Horse, Dr Gross's, cured by smelling an infinitesimal, 228.
 Hospital returns, comparison of those of the homœopathic Vienna hospital with the Edinburgh Infirmary, 97; with the provincial Scottish, 102; dishonesty of some of Fleischman's returns, 107; Mr Sampson's superstrong statistics, 98, 99; Dr Gairdner's remarks, 92, 101; Thomson's five fatal hospital diseases, 99; London homœopathic hospitals, their character, 276.
 Huddersfield, cholera at, 90.
 Idiosyncracies, all persons alleged to suffer from, 220; instances of, 221; in diet, 222.
 Illusions and quackeries, patrons of, 145.
 Imagination, cures produced and aided by, 86, 258.
 Infection, globules prepared by, 44.
 Infinitesimal doses, analysis of alleged, 33; argument for action of, derived from mental phenomena, 232; ditto, derived from inoculation, 233; ditto, derived from smells, 234; ditto, derived from mineral waters, 235; an essential element of homœopathy, 38, 39; calculations regarding amount of drugs in, 283; actual presence of drugs in, attempted to be proved physically, 119, 120; curative effect of, independent of quantity, 229; Dr Henderson upon, 280; inefficacious in cure of ague, 248; nature and mode of preparing, 40, 42; number of triturations required for, 41; poisoning by alleged, 190; supposed proofs of efficacy of, 120, 125; repetition of, 225; supersensibility of diseased parts to, 215.
 Infinity, homœopathy said to have this character from its infinitesimals, 23.
 Inoculation, argument for infinitesimal doses derived from, 233.
 Insanity caused by itch, 115.
 Iodine, action of, not ascertainable on healthy body, 253; cure of goitre by, 68, 252; does not cause goitre, 68, 253.
 Ipecacuanha, action of, in asthma, 217, 219; in vomiting, 274.
 Isopathy, doctrine of, Luz, 80.
 Itch or psora produced by presence of an insect (acarus), 25, 271; causes sevenths of all chronic diseases, 24, 271, 114, 142; may attack the mind and cause insanity, 115; cured by internal doses of lice, 28; cured by internal doses of itch insect, 28; by sulphur in 30th dilution, 184; moral, religious, political, and physical results of, 24; obstructs spiritual conversion, 28; relative treatment of, by homœopathy and legitimate medicine, 183; hereditary, 24; not hereditary, 271; transformations of itch insect, 142.

- Korsakoff, prepares globules by infection or contagium, 44.
- Lama physicians of Tartary, cure by names of drugs, 86.
- Leipsic, condition of homœopathy in, 31; its homœopathic hospital defunct, 35.
- Lemon-juice a remedy for sea-scurvy, but not homœopathic, 252.
- Leprosy of scripture, is itch, 24.
- Leucorrhœa cured by internal doses of potentized leucorrhœal matter, 29.
- Lice, doses of, produce 283 symptoms, 29; itch cured by, 28.
- London, character of homœopathic hospitals in, 276.
- Long, St John, history of, 37; medical knowledge of, 200; alleged extraction of mercury by, 203.
- Lungs, spontaneous cure of inflammation of, 17, 105.
- Mackay, Dr, on witchcraft, 144.
- Madden, Dr, on amateur homœopaths, 277; on the magnetoscope, 122, 124, 127, 131, 133, 134; on auxiliaries, 196.
- Magnetism or mesmerism and the passions, provings and symptoms of, 67; adoption by homœopathy, 193.
- Magnetoscope, the, 120, 137; its infallibility and evidence for homœopathy, 129, 118; its fallibility detected and confessed, 131; moral, 137; experiments with, 122, etc.; propositions supposed to be proved by it, 124; affected by a 40,000 dilution of arsenic, 126; as certain as a mathematical equation, 129; but all its movements the result of muscular movements on the part of the operator, 133, etc.
- Male-fern, no provings of; yet alleged to be homœopathic, 181.
- Measles, and small-pox, similar but do not cure each other, 168, etc.; curative of herpes and miliaria, which are dissimilar to it, 165; preventive of dissimilar hooping-cough, 159; Bosquillon misrepresented, 160.
- Medical confidence, beneficial influence of, 83; Hahnemann's reliance upon, 17, 88.
- Medicinal aggravations, a paramount principle of homœopathy, 205, 209; in infants, 207; scepticism among homœopaths, respecting, 211.
- Medicines, curative power of, dependent on medicinal aggravation of the disease, 209; made by infection, 44; potentized by being carried in the pocket, 42; potentized by repeated shakes, 43; spiritual powers of, 140; increase the vital force, 213. (See also *Drugs*.)
- Medicines (simple) rendered compound by trituration, 49; rule regarding administration of, 46; ditto, violated by homœopaths themselves, 47, 49.
- Mental delusions, various kinds from various drugs, 77.
- Mental impressions, curative, and fatal results from, 86, 258; provings of drugs nullified by, 257.
- Mental phenomena, argument for infinitesimal doses derived from, 232.
- Metallic tractors, Perkins', 37, 85.
- Microscope appealed to in order to prove drugs in infinitesimal doses, 119.
- Miliaria cured by measles, 165.
- Mineral waters, argument for infinitesimal doses derived from, 235.
- Mongrel homœopaths of Hahnemann, 19, 194.
- Moon to be attended to in giving some drugs, 75.
- Moore, Dr, on medical evidence, 81, 197.
- Moral and religious symptoms produced and cured by various drugs, 30.
- Mormonism and Hahnemannism, comparison of, 10, 148.
- Mortality, diminution of, in England, 116; diminution among infants, 117.
- Mure, Dr, condemnation of mixed practice, 19; the indefatigable apostle of homœopathy, 22.
- Names, homœopathy swallowing of names of drugs, 276; Tartars cured also thus, 86.
- Naples, experiments with homœopathy at, 276.
- Natural physics, course of, inverted in homœopathy, 143.
- Neligan, Dr, on cure of itch, 185.
- Newton, Sir Isaac, Hahnemann likened to, 245.
- Oath administered by homœopathic candidates, 5, 23.
- Odours, supposed argument for infinitesimal doses derived from, 234.
- Olfaction, exhibition of doses by, 62, 65.
- Omission, dangers from, in homœopathic treatment, 198, 278.
- Opium, a very compound substance frequently indicated, 47; indicated in some forms of coma, 68.
- Oyster-shell, contradictory symptoms of, 260; number of symptoms produced by, 259.
- Palo-coto, or goitre-stick, remedy for goitre, 253.
- Paraplegia, as a result of homœopathic treatment, 197.
- Paris, experiments made at, to test homœopathy, 258, 275.
- Paris, Dr, his letter to a homœopathic candidate, 1.
- Pathological anatomy, Hahnemann's opinion on, 9, 174.
- Perkins, his patent metallic-tractors, 37, 85; certificates in their favour, 37; their wondrous effects, 85.
- Petition, homœopathic, to University of Edinburgh, 7.
- Physical phenomena, as a supposed proof of homœopathy, 149.
- Piano, cough excited by playing on, cured by carbonate of lime, 75.
- Pleurisy, treatment of, by homœopaths and legitimate physicians, 176; Dr Copeland's definitions, 76; absence of external

- symptoms in, 178; alleged effect of squills on, *ib.*
- Pneumonia, a touch-stone of skill, 103; observations of Lonis, Grisolle, Dietl, on its frequent spontaneous cure, 17, 105; statistics of its treatment by Dietl, without medicine, 105; incorrectness of Dr Fleischmann's homœopathic reports, 106; same results from homœopathic treatment and no treatment at all, 105, 106; symptoms, duration, etc. of it varied by proper treatment, 110; small mortality from it in Army and Navy returns, 113.
- Polypus, relative treatment of in homœopathy and legitimate medicine, compared, 182.
- Potencies, description of, 279.
- Potentizing, doctrine of. (See Dynamization.)
- Prohibitions in diet, homœopathic, 83.
- Proving of drugs made in different ways, 68; importance, 77; imposture practised by, 259; nature of Hahnemann's, 257-8; their morality, 75.
- Psora. (See Itch.)
- Quack, Dr Mead's anecdote of a London, 238; Matthews' letter to, 178.
- Quackery, sums spent in advertising, and for stamps, 239; promoted by the clergy, 145.
- Quack systems, enumeration of the more prevalent, 78, 80.
- Quin, Dr, on the magnetoscope, 120, 123.
- Quinine does not produce ague, 243-4; number of symptoms of, 259.
- Quintillionths, the amount of sugar and fluid required for, 65, 283, 285.
- Radetsky, Field-Marshal, case of, 270.
- Rationale of homœopathic method of cure, 212; its contradictory character, 213.
- Regimen, remedial efficacy of, 82.
- Religious symptoms caused and cured by various drugs, 30.
- Religious conversion aided by homœopathic globules, 27, 29.
- Repetition of dose, rules laid down by Hahnemann regarding, 225; results of too frequent, 227; allegations about one single dose or smell curing a pleurisy, etc., 177.
- Resolutions of the colleges and medical societies, 1. 8.
- Routh, Dr, fallacies of homœopathy, 93.
- Rubbing quackery, its history, 78; theory, 204; character, 201.
- Russell, Dr R., origin of homœopathy, 242, 245; on ipecacuan, etc., 274.
- Russia, experiments with homœopathy in, 276.
- Rutter, Mr, his magnetoscope and experiments, 121, etc.; Dr Quin's remarks, 120; Dr King's, 121.
- Salt, a powerful medicament in 30th dilution, 45; provings or symptoms of, 72; quantity in a tear, super-Hahnemannic, 71.
- Scarlet fever, alleged prophylactic power of Belladonna against, refuted, 230.
- Scripture, homœopathic interpretations of, 25; homœopathy foreshadowed in, 24.
- Scaling-wax, fatal results after swallowing a drop, 258.
- Sea-scurvy, cure of by lemon-juice, etc., 251; its former ravages, *ib.*
- Shakes, increase the potencies of drugs, 43; number required in preparing medicines, 43; Hahnemann's rules, 264.
- Silex, symptoms from, 48; in every homœopathic drug from the mortar used, 48.
- Similarity of symptoms, amount of, not defined, 163; must be great, 164; failures of law when similarity great, 169; success where not great similarity, 166, 167.
- Similia similibus curantur*, law of, 237; defects of proof of it, 240, 254; supposed analogies in physical and moral phenomena, 149; ditto in nature's cures, 151; an infallible law, 237, 254; an infallible universal law, 237-8, 245; but disproved, 254; ditto in case of cinchona, 246; in vaccination, 249; in scurvy, 251; goitre, etc., 252; failure of, in production of ague, 243; failure of, in cutaneous diseases, 240; a law in witchcraft, 147.
- Small-pox, its alleged removal of cow-pox given by Hahnemann as proof of homœopathy, 152; Hahnemann's own authority states the very reverse, 153; cow-pox concurrent with, 156; Bosquet's deductions, 158; cure of amaurosis, ophthalmia, etc., by, 166; prevention of, by vaccination, 241; a non-recurrent disease, 250; effects of vaccination upon, 249; thuja, an alleged specific for, 249; treated by internal doses of small-pox matter, 29.
- Small-pox and Measles, similarity of, 168; but not curative of each other, 170.
- Smells, argument for infinitesimal doses derived from, 234.
- Smelling of dry globules, Hahnemann's last favourite mode of exhibiting his medicines, 62-65; smell of a gold fee, 65.
- Snow-friction remedy for frost-bite, not homœopathic, 255; ditto explained, 256.
- Speech on homœopathy at Medico-Chirurgical Society, 8-20.
- Spiritualisation of drugs by shaking and rubbing, 23, 140.
- Starch-pills, symptoms and cures from, 258.
- Statistics of homœopathic hospitals, 90; causes influencing, 94; modified by grade of patients, *ib.*; modified by hospital arrangements, 95; modified by age of patients admitted, 96; modified by nature of diseases, 97-101; modified by errors in nomenclature, 102; of homœopathic compared with British hospitals, 102; of private homœopathic practice, 90.
- Statistical proof of diminution of mortality in London, etc., 116, 117.
- Stephen, Mrs, her specific for gravel and stone, 36; ditto, purchased by the British Parliament, 36; defended by Dr Hartley, 36.
- Sugar, amount of, required to reduce one grain, 267; to quintillionth, 65, 283; or decillionth globules, 53, 284.

- Supersensibility of diseased parts, alleged action of doses explained by, 215.
- Symptomatology, homœopathy based on, 174, 237; in watch-mending, 175.
- Symptoms from drugs, contradictory character of, from some drugs, 259; durations of, 259; knowledge of alone required for homœopathic practice, 66-7; modes of ascertaining, 68; number of referred to each drug, 259; produced in healthy individuals by drugs, 69.
- Talisman of Lee, cures by it, 84.
- Tapeworm, relative treatment of in homœopathy and legitimate medicine, 179.
- Taylor, Dr, analysis of alleged infinitesimal doses, 33; poisoning by an alleged infinitesimal dose, 190.
- Theology, homœopathic, 21-30.
- Thuja an alleged specific for small-pox, 249; ditto denied by Trinks, *ib.*
- Toothache in a storm, its homœopathic cure, 75.
- Touching, royal, for scrofula, 84.
- Triturations and shakings of drugs to spiritualize them, 23, 141; number required for preparing homœopathic medicines, 41; potency of drugs increased by, 45; great deviations in the shakes, 43.
- Vaccination, argument derived from prevention of small-pox by, 241, 249.
- Veterinary practice, homœopathy applied to, 228, 261.
- Vienna, number of pupils at homœopathic hospitals in, 34.
- Vis medicatrix naturæ, 82; Hahnemann's faith in, 17.
- Vital force, the, increased by homœopathic medicines, 213.
- Vomiting, ipœœuanha in, 274.
- Watch-making and homœopathy compared, 175.
- Whately, Dr, his logic, 35; his practice, 7.
- Willan and Hahnemann, 154.
- Williams, Dr, on homœopathic omissions and effects, 278.
- Wine an alleged exception to homœopathic law, 46.
- Witchcraft, its analogies with belief in homœopathy, in alleged spiritual powers of drugs, 140; in doctrine of transformations, 142; in abrogations of laws of physics by both, 143; the similia similibus in witchcraft, 147.
- Women frequent victims of illusions, 145.
- Wood, Dr, his computations regarding the infinitesimal doses, 59.

FINIS.

WORKS PUBLISHED BY SUTHERLAND AND KNOX.

CLASSICAL AND EDUCATIONAL WORKS.

	£	s.	d.
Blackie (Professor) on Classical Literature, 8vo,	0	0	6
Blackie (Professor) on Greek Pronunciation, 8vo,	0	3	6
Blackie (Professor) on the Rhythmical Declamation of the Ancients, 8vo,	0	1	0
"Carmina Non Prius Audita," foolscap,	0	1	6
<hr/>			
Armstrong's Introduction to English Composition. Part I., fep.,	0	2	0
Armstrong's Introduction to English Composition. Part II., fep.,	0	2	0
Armstrong's English Composition, both Parts in one,	0	3	6
Elliot's Complete Practical Geometry and Mensuration, 8vo,	0	5	0
Key to do.	0	6	0
Elliot's Complete Practical Logarithms and Trigonometry, 8vo,	0	5	0
Key to do.,	0	3	0
Elliot's Elementary Algebra, 2s. Key, 2s.			
Elliot's Elementary Geometry and Mensuration, 2s. 6d. Key, 2s. 6d.			
Elliot's Elementary Logarithms and Trigonometry, 2s. 6d. Key, 2s. 6d.			
Macdonald's Vocabulary of Greek and Latin Roots, 18mo,	0	0	6
Macdowall's Rhetorical Readings for Schools, 12mo. 3d Edition,	0	2	6
Macintosh's English Grammar, foolscap,	0	2	0
Rae's First Lessons in Arithmetic, 18mo,	0	0	6
Rhind's Physical Geography. Part I.—Inorganic Nature, fep. 4th Edition,	0	1	0
Rhind's Physical Geography. Part II.—Organic Life, foolscap. 2d Edition, 1s. 3d. Both Parts in one vol.,	0	2	3
Scrymgeour's Readings in Literature and Science, for Senior Classes, 12mo. 2d Edition,	0	3	6

EDUCATIONAL MODELS.

Planetarium, exhibiting the Planets in their relative Magnitudes, and their Revolutions round the Sun at their Proportionate Dis- tances. Height, 30 inches.	2	2	0
Tellurarium, showing the Revolution of the Earth round the Sun, that of the Moon round the Earth, Eclipses, etc. Height, 31 in.	1	11	6
Tellurium, illustrating the precession of the Equinoxes, Rotation of Saturn's Rings, etc. Height, 13 inches,	1	11	6
Description of the above, including a Sketch of Astronomy,	0	0	6
Mollison's Perforated Planisphere, with moveable Horizon, showing Position of the Stars at any hour or day throughout the year. 18 inches diameter,	0	7	6
Description of the above, with Outlines of Astronomy, 18mo,	0	1	0
Geometrical Models, containing 18 pieces. In a box,	0	9	0

WORKS PUBLISHED BY SUTHERLAND AND KNOX.

	£	s.	d.
MEDICAL AND SCIENTIFIC WORKS.			
Bennett (Professor) on Cancer, 8vo,	0	12	0
Bennett (Professor) on Leucoeythemia, 8vo,	0	10	6
Bennett's (Professor) Clinical Medicine. In Parts, each	0	2	0
Bennett's (Professor) Introduction to Clinical Medicine, foolscap,	0	5	0
Boggie (Dr) on Hospital Gangrene, 8vo,	0	4	6
Chalmers (C.) on Electricity, 8vo,	0	2	6
Gairdner's (Dr) Pathology of Bronchitis, 8vo,	0	2	6
Goodsir's (Professor) Annals of Anatomy. Parts I. and II., each	0	3	6
Hannover (Dr) on the Microscope. Edited by Professor Goodsir,	0	5	0
Miller (Professor) on Medical Missions, 18mo,	0	1	0
Redfern's (Dr) Anormal Nutrition in the Articular Cartilages, 8vo,	0	3	6
Reid's (Professor) Physiological Researches, 8vo,	0	7	6
Sanders (Dr) on the Spleen, 8vo,	0	2	6
Simpson's (Professor) Contributions to Obstetric Pathology and Practice. Part I.	0	2	6
Simpson's Homœopathy, its Tenents and Tendencies, 8vo,	0	7	6
Syme's (Professor) Principles of Surgery, 8vo. Third Edition,	0	15	0
Syme's Supplement to do.,	0	1	6
Syme's Contributions to Pathology and Praetice of Surgery, 8vo,	0	10	6
Syme's Stricture of the Urethra, 8vo,	0	3	6
Syme's Diseases of the Rectum, 12mo. Second Edition,	0	4	0
Syme's Exeision of Diseased Joints, 8vo,	0	5	0
Wilson's (Dr Geo.) Life of Dr John Reid, feap. Second Edition,	0	4	0

POETRY.

Beranger's Lyriical Poems. Translated by Anderson. Foolscap,	0	2	6
Brown's (Frances) Lyrics and Poems, foolscap,	0	2	6
Gilfillan's (Robert) Poems and Songs, 12mo,	0	3	6
Marshall's (Rev. John) Lays and Lectures, foolscap,	0	1	6
Poetical Illustrations of the Achievements of Wellington, 8vo,	0	12	0
Riddell's (H. S.) Poems and Songs, foolscap,	0	5	0

PERIODICALS.

TAIT'S MAGAZINE, Monthly, as published.

MONTHLY JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE.

SCOTTISH FLORIST, Monthly, as published.

SUTHERLAND AND KNOX, EDINBURGH.
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., LONDON.

AND SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

